

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 654

SO 023 846

AUTHOR Fonte, John, Ed.; Ryerson, Andre, Ed.
 TITLE Education for America's Role in World Affairs.
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
 Washington, DC.
 PUB DATE Feb 94
 CONTRACT 300-87-0014; 403J47900535-537
 NOTE 199p.
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides --
 Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Citizenship Education; Cultural
 Awareness; Elementary Secondary Education; *Global
 Approach; Interdisciplinary Approach; *International
 Education; International Relations; Multicultural
 Education; *Social Studies; *World Affairs
 IDENTIFIERS *Global Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of essays by leading policy analysts and educators investigate the often contradictory claims of global, peace, multicultural and citizenship education and examines what U.S. students should know about world affairs in the post-cold war era. The essays suggest methods of change based on a strong academic core of history, international relations, government, economics, and geography. After a foreword (Chester E. Finn, Jr.) and introduction (John Fonte; Andre Ryerson), the essays follow in this order: (1) "A Brief History of Pre-Collegiate Global and International Studies Education" (Andrew Smith); (2) "Global Education and Controversy: Some Observations" (Robert Fullinwider); (3) "Teaching about the World and Our Nation's Heritage: The Relationship between International Education and Education for American Citizenship" (John Fonte); (4) "Implications of the 'New Demographics' and the 'Information Explosion' for International Education" (Herbert London); (5) "International Education: The Search for Subject" (Gilbert T. Sewall); (6) "International Studies in the School Curriculum" (Diane Ravitch); (7) "Geography's Role in International Education" (Raymond English); (8) "China: Case-Study of Textbook Failures" (Andre Ryerson); and (9) "What American Students Should Know about the World" (Owen Harries). Following a conclusion by the editors, three extensive bibliographies provide information for critics and specialists in the field, for educators in international education, and for introducing the ERIC system of reference and retrieval. An addendum lists works not found in the other sections.

(CK)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

Education for America's Role in World Affairs

Edited by

John Fonte and André Ryerson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

50 023 846

Seven of the ten essays in this publication were supported by work funded by the United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, contract number 300-87-0014 and contract numbers 403J47900535-537. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement and no official endorsement should be implied or inferred.

Foreword

Chester E. Finn, Jr.

The astonishing changes in our contemporary world sometimes run headlong into the decrepitude of American education. How can we even make sense out of dramatic events beyond our borders, let alone participate adroitly in shaping them, when our young people have accumulated so little pertinent knowledge in their brains?

Several years ago on television news Tom Brokaw interviewed a U.S. Marine, perspiring in the Arabian desert where he had been sent as part of the American response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait a few weeks before. What had he known about Saudi Arabia before getting there? the NBC anchorman asked. "I never even knew it existed," the young serviceman replied with a grin.

Less than a year earlier, as totalitarian regimes crumbled in eastern Europe, the *Washington Post* recounted the frustration of U.S. high school teachers who were striving to impress on their students the import of these momentous events. Not many youngsters were interested; few found them noteworthy; fewer still possessed the background knowledge against which to interpret them. "They don't understand what communism is in the first place," observed one California teacher. "So when you say it's the death of communism, they don't know what you're talking about." In an honors government class in Texas, a pupil asked "What is this talk of satellites. I'm confused. Are we talking about satellite dishes or what?"

It's not possible to build a skyscraper on swampy ground without first sinking pilings and pouring foundations. International education cannot be any stronger than the skill and knowledge base that it rests on, a base that should consist—here I echo President Clinton, former President Bush, and all the nation's governors—of history, geography, English, math and science. Solid educational foundations are essential if our young people are one day to possess a sophisticated understanding of what is going on in their world and why. Properly educating today's students for tomorrow's world accordingly means meticulous attention to both the "domestic" and the "international" portions of what they learn and—perhaps most interesting of all—to the junctures between these. That's why efforts to improve international education need to proceed in tandem with the broader "excellence movement" now striving to renew American education.

Though we cannot yet be sure that this general reform effort will succeed, I'm more optimistic today than at any point since we were declared a "nation at risk" in 1983. The six ambitious national education goals that the governors have set for the year 2000, and the mounting impatience of elected officials, business leaders and ordinary citizens throughout the land, have created an auspicious climate for real education reform to take root and flourish.

That means the time is also at hand to pay renewed attention to the issues examined in this timely and thoughtful volume. When we do, we swiftly realize that clear thinking about what tomorrow's adults should know and be able to do in relation to the larger world is fraught with implications for our vexing domestic education debates as well. Can we really have "world class" education standards at home, for example, without knowing a great deal more than most of us do today about what is taught and how well it is learned in classrooms overseas? Can we resolve the endless arguments about "multi-cultural" education if we don't understand more about the other cultures that share our planet and how they touch upon our own? As for the sometimes nasty dispute between "Eurocentric" and "Afrocentric" approaches to education in school and college, what about the vast portions of the world that are neither?

Attending to such issues, of course, does not necessarily resolve our differences in opinions or priorities. So long as it's impossible for youngsters to learn everything, grown-ups will continue to quarrel about what's most important for them to learn. So long as adults affirm contrary social values and cling to rival ideological positions, these tensions will make their way into discussions about the school curriculum. So long as people hold dissimilar hopes for the future, they will argue about the correct interpretation of the past.

Such tensions do not vanish, even in the aftermath of democratic revolutions. They may even worsen, at least for a while. I've been in schools in post-

communist eastern Europe where staff members eye each other with profound suspicion grounded in prior support for—or hostility toward—“the party.” Choices about what to teach children in those schools are inseparable from decisions about who will do the teaching. And in Nicaragua I’ve seen new history textbooks, written as successors to the volumes of lies forced upon schools in the Sandinista era, with their last few pages ripped out because still-influential Sandinistas in the education ministry don’t care for their revised interpretation of the events of the 1980s.

By comparison, most U.S. educational disputes are tamer, and the end of the “cold war” has largely removed one major source of argument over what to teach young Americans about the contemporary world. But dozens of difficult issues remain—such as environmentalism, South Africa and the Middle East, to note just three.

This volume won’t dispel those tensions or put an end to the disputes, but it will help U.S. educators and policy-makers to think more clearly about the principles by which they may be handled, the terms in which they can be presented, the knowledge base that should underlie any reasonable resolution of them, and the linkages between them and the general curriculum.

Remember, today’s American children—the putative beneficiaries of these discussions—will be tomorrow’s voters and leaders in the planet’s only remaining superpower. That alone lays a daunting responsibility onto those who would educate them well. It raises the stakes. It stiffens the challenge. And it makes the clear thinking, solid information and good sense in this volume all the more welcome.

Contents

EDUCATION FOR AMERICA'S ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

<i>Foreword</i>	v
Chester E. Finn, Jr.	
<i>Introduction</i>	ix
John Fonte and André Ryerson	
<i>A Brief History of Pre-Collegiate Global and International Studies Education</i>	1
Andrew Smith	
<i>Global Education and Controversy: Some Observations</i>	23
Robert Fullinwider	
<i>Teaching About the World and Our Nation's Heritage: The Relationship Between International Education and Education for American Citizenship</i>	31
John Fonte	
<i>Implications of the "New Demographics" and the "Information Explosion" for International Education</i>	39
Herbert London	

<i>International Education: The Search for Subject</i>	43
Gilbert T. Sewall	
<i>International Studies in the School Curriculum</i>	55
Diane Ravitch	
<i>Geography's Role in International Education</i>	67
Raymond English	
<i>China: Case-Study of Textbook Failures</i>	75
André Ryerson	
<i>What American Students Should Know About the World</i>	97
Owen Harries	
<i>Conclusion</i>	103
John Fonte and André Ryerson	
<i>Bibliography</i>	113
<i>Addendum</i>	179
<i>About the Contributors</i>	187
<i>Index</i>	191

Introduction

John Fonte and André Ryerson

The international arena of the future will present a complex mix of challenges for Americans in economics, trade, technology, politics, ideas, and culture. To meet these challenges education for America's role in world affairs must be strengthened at all levels. Not surprisingly, our political and business leaders have called for a new emphasis on "international education," by which is meant a knowledge of the world beyond our borders and specifically: world history, international politics and economics, global geography, and foreign languages. In February, 1989, a report of the National Governors' Association (NGA) endorsed expanding "international education for all students—from pre-school through graduate school and beyond." One year later the "National Goals for Education" developed by the president and the nation's governors declared that "all students" should be knowledgeable "about the world community." By 1993, 38 states had either mandated or recommended the inclusion of a "global perspective" in their respective secondary school curricula, and "global studies" for undergraduates was proliferating in higher education and teacher training programs.

This book is an attempt to focus on some of the crucial issues of international education. Our strategy has been to concentrate on the deeper and long-range questions that will be debated and analyzed for decades to come. Some of these questions are the following:

1. What is the purpose of international education? Of citizenship education? What is the relationship between "education with a global perspective" and traditional American citizenship education? In general,

should international education affirm the values of the American political heritage? Is this ethnocentric, or legitimate cultural transmission?

2. What should be the content of international education? Should the emphasis be on history, geography, and economics, or on global studies? What conceptual framework or organizing principle should we employ to best make sense of education in world affairs? Should it be history? Or non-historical cultural studies?
3. Does the "new demographics" (more minorities in schools) and the "information explosion" fundamentally change international and civic education, or does a core framework remain?
4. How do we objectively present the interplay of international economic, environmental, resource, population, and development issues? What should students learn about the impact of different economic systems and cultural values on economic development?

The authors of this volume include: Diane Ravitch, former Assistant Secretary of Education; Gilbert T. Sewell, Director, American Textbook Council; Herbert London, John M. Olin Professor of the Humanities, New York University; Robert Fullinwider, Research Associate, Center for Philosophy and Public Policy, University of Maryland; Andrew Smith, President, American Forum for Global Perspectives in Education; Owen Harries, Editor, the *National Interest*; the late Raymond English, Scholar, Ethics and Public Policy Center; and the editors John Fonte, formerly a Senior Research Associate at the United States Department of Education and currently a Humanities Administrator at the National Endowment for the Humanities, and André Ryerson, educational consultant and writer.

We hope the book will serve a wide variety of audiences. It is designed to inform lay people as well as professional educators about the major issues of international/global education and how the field is related to education for American citizenship. We have assembled a bibliography of value to specialist and non-specialist that includes some historical analyses along with the major books, articles, reports, curricular guides, etc., on international and global education that are used in the field in pre-collegiate and post-secondary education. We would like to thank some outstanding educators who assisted in developing the bibliography: professors C. Frederick Risinger and John J. Patrick of the ERIC Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University; Andrew Smith, President of the American Forum for Global Perspectives in Education, in New York; Jeffrey A. Gray, formerly a fellow at the World Without War Council in Berkeley, California; Sally Stoecker of the Rand Corporation in Washington, D.C.; Charles

F. Bahmueller of the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California; and Mary Lord of the ACCESS information network in Washington, D.C. We would also like to thank Dr. Paul Gagnon and Dr. Robert Leestma of the United States Department of Education, for their helpful suggestions.

Finally, with sadness, we wish to acknowledge the loss of an esteemed colleague and good friend, Raymond English, who contributed an important essay to this volume. For more than thirty years Raymond English was an outstanding leader, an exemplar of reason and scholarship in the field of civics, social studies, and international education. Besides writing innumerable articles and essays, he was the author of a seminal textbook series in the social studies, *Concepts and Inquiry*, and recently edited an important work, *Teaching International Politics in High School* (1989). Educated at Cambridge, an officer in the British Army during World War II, a teacher at Harvard and Kenyon, a scholar at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, an urbane, witty and generous man, Raymond will be sorely missed.

Note: The editors' contributions to this volume do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the United States Department of Education or any other federal agency, and no official endorsement or concurrence is intended or should be inferred.

A Brief History of Pre-collegiate Global and International Studies Education

Andrew F. Smith

Introduction

The cataclysmic events during the past few years in the Middle East, China, Eastern Europe, Southern Africa and Central America have underlined the importance of American citizens' knowledge and understanding about the world and our nation's role in it. The cold war has become a part of history. Despite some observers identifying this period as "the end of history," these changes are likely to make our lives more complex, complicated and difficult. Simultaneously, we will be confronted with new and exciting opportunities. This new global challenge will not be as easy to understand as the simplistic bi-polar world of the past. It will be multi-dimensional in scope, and global in character. The victors of this new global challenge are likely to be those who have the requisite competencies and skills necessary to take advantage of the opportunities while avoiding the difficulties inherent within this new global age. This global challenge has implications for the nation's school system.

To survive and thrive in this multi-polar world, American citizens will be required to know more about other nations, better understand other cultures, and will need to understand complex foreign policy alternatives more than ever in the past. This can not be done without an adequate understanding of American history and culture, and competence in the English language. New global conditions clearly require a solid background in geography and world history, and improved instruction in foreign languages. However, reinstituting and improving these

courses is clearly not enough. The educational challenge for the future will be to define what is enough, and to help determine how this can be efficiently and effectively accomplished in an educational environment beset with so many other problems.

World Understanding in the 1940s

Educating for citizenship is a central mission of the school curriculum.¹ Traditionally, citizenship education has been viewed narrowly as the study of governmental institutions and the relationship of individual citizens to those institutions.² Recently, this definition has been extended to include the development of skills in making decisions and participating in public affairs.³ These commitments have usually been met through the teaching of civics, American government and history.

Historically, the schools have also had a responsibility to educate Americans about the world. Most states and school districts have requirements to promote understanding of other nations and cultures. These commitments have been woven into the "expanding horizons" approach in social studies programs in the elementary schools. In secondary schools, these commitments have been met through courses such as world history, world geography, and foreign language courses.

While international education efforts in the United States have roots extending back to the 1920s and 1930s, these activities were at best tangential to the traditional curriculum of elementary and secondary schools. A major change occurred after World War II. The educational efforts of UNESCO and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, a quasi-governmental body created by Congress in 1946, were influential during the early international education efforts. Activities of the Commission, such as the Associated Schools Project which linked schools across the world and published materials for educators,⁴ encouraged international activities in many schools.

These post-war efforts were based upon idealistic values, and were, in part, interested in promoting peace and harmony throughout the world. As "war begins in the minds of men," the schools were the logical place to inculcate values which would eventually promote peace and justice. There was also a belief that if we only understood each other better, there would be fewer conflicts. There was no single organized attempt to infuse these beliefs into the schools, and these values were promoted by a wide range of political, community and religious organizations. Some supported the notion of "one world"; some promoted teaching about "world federalism"; others encouraged teaching about international organizations,

particularly the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Still others promoted international exchanges in order to promote peace, one person at a time.

Many changes were advocated by community-based organizations. These efforts can be divided into three major types: international exchange organizations, non-partisan foreign policy organizations, and special interest groups which advocated particular positions on international issues.

International exchange programs dramatically expanded with the creation of the Fulbright program in 1947. The Fulbright program concentrated initially upon academic and scholarly exchanges, but later expanded to include the exchange of pre-collegiate teachers and administrators. The American Field Service launched its exchange of high school students in 1949.⁵ While this program initially involved a handful of students, pre-collegiate international exchange programs expanded dramatically during the following decades, and today dozens of profit and non-profit organizations annually engage more than 40,000 high school students in exchange and international travel programs.⁶

As a result of the pressure and support from community groups, many schools developed international relations elective courses in secondary schools, and current events periods dotted the curriculum. International relations clubs were created for those students interested in such topics, and students from these clubs often were included in activities of world affairs councils. Model United Nations programs were established in several regions of the country. Some proponents encouraged schools to reduce the nationalism which they believed was endemic to the American elementary and secondary school curriculum. To what extent (if any) this de-nationalism effort actually affected the schools remains a disputed issue. However, even a casual comparison of American history textbooks from the 1930s and those published after 1945 clearly demonstrates that the nationalism inherent in some textbooks was toned down, but was still clearly a significant element.

These idealistic efforts raised many questions. Would world understanding really promote peace? Did the idealistic approach reflect a balanced presentation of international events? Were international exchange activities mainly for the individuals involved or could they also contribute to the general learning within the school about other cultures? Was international education only for those who could afford these exchange programs? Was international education to be solely an extracurricular activity as exemplified by Model United Nations programs? Was international education for only the few, mainly college bound students who took elective courses or joined international relations clubs? Or was it to be a part of education for all students? Was the purpose of public education to teach about the world, or was it to advocate particular answers to world problems? To what

extent should schools be influenced by outside organizations? These questions continued to confront American education, and many remain unresolved today.

The Cold War and International Education in the 1950s

Beginning in the early 1950s several discernible approaches appeared in pre-collegiate international education. These approaches depended upon one's view of the world and one's view of education.

The first approach focused upon American foreign policy. During the late 1940s and early 1950s, several community-based organizations launched educational programs which focused upon the schools. For instance, the Philadelphia World Affairs Council traces its roots to 1949, and included in its charter a mandate to work with the schools. Other world affairs councils established educational programs, including those in Cleveland, Boston and San Francisco. From 1956 to 1967 the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project developed a major curriculum project for pre-collegiate educators and sold one million copies of the Foreign Relations Series. The foreign policy approach has thrived in the subsequent decades, as particularly exemplified by the Foreign Policy Association's "Great Decisions Program," and other educational programs of world affairs councils.

As the cold war heated up, a second approach emerged as a response to the perceived threat of the Soviet Union. This approach stressed the importance of teaching "Americanism" and anti-totalitarianism. Many state legislatures mandated requirements that schools teach about the evils of totalitarianism, particularly communism. There was also a fear that communists and their fellow-travelers had targeted the schools as vehicles to subvert our nation's youth. Teachers were required to sign loyalty oaths. While many of these requirements were removed subsequently, some states and school districts continue to mandate such requirements today, and the concerns raised by advocates of this approach continue to be heard.

A third approach emerged from those who were ideologically opposed to progressive education. According to some critics, pre-collegiate education had suffered egregiously during the progressive era. This produced students who could not read, write, or compute, and who did not have a basic understanding of American government and history. Some argued that these should be the priorities for pre-collegiate education, and that schools needed to concentrate upon these basics. Additional burdens, such as those advocated by other international educators, only detracted from meeting these basic needs. Agitation for basic education has continued throughout the succeeding four decades. Some advocates

for this approach have expanded it to include the teaching of world history, geography and the study of foreign language.

A fourth approach, related to the preceding one, was concerned with the improvement of academic standards in pre-collegiate education. Pre-collegiate education was outdated. The curriculum, textbooks and teaching standards needed to be dramatically improved. As a result of the Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957, a strong emphasis was placed upon academic rigor in pre-collegiate education. This concern led to the passage of the National Defense in Education Act in 1958.⁷

While these four approaches influenced the schools, their effects were limited. Even where programs were mandated, many teachers did not have adequate materials to teach these subjects, and few teachers had any academic preparation to do so effectively. The emphasis upon the development of curriculum materials and effective teacher education programs expanded in the 1960s. Schools found themselves pressured by two major groups. The first was a top down education approach, wherein college and university experts pressured schools to improve the teaching of area studies. The other was a bottom up approach from the local community to improve the teaching of foreign policy and international issues and subjects.

Area Studies and International Education in the 1960s

The traditional world history course was mainly Eurocentric. Asia, Africa and Latin America, if included in the curriculum at all, were viewed mainly as adjuncts to European or American history courses. Area studies programs encouraged schools to include an understanding of and appreciation for other nations and cultures, and subsequently, culture studies courses were added to the traditional social studies programs.

Major tensions were inherent within the area studies programs to the extent they were applied to pre-collegiate education. These tensions included conceptual issues with regard to boundaries between the traditional Eurocentric course of study and the new interest in the developing world; priorities within and among different area studies; and how best to educate teachers who may not have had any academic preparation in non-western studies. The following types of questions emerged from these tensions: What was the appropriate relationship between world history courses and non-western history and civilization? Should new courses be created? How would teachers, most of whom did not have the background in non-western history and culture, be educated to teach about these new areas? Should all world areas be taught, and if so, what should be removed

from the curriculum to make room for these programs? If not, what criteria should be used to select what should be included in non-western studies?

Two major criticisms soon emerged. The first was that some culture studies programs were little more than "travelogues" that attempted to include over 100 nations and cultures in a semester by examining these "strange lands and friendly people." Some programs degenerated into the holiday curriculum in which cultures and nations were studied in a day, or week. These programs were sometimes connected with a food festival in which tacos might be eaten for lunch on "Cinco de Mayo," and students would then understand what it was like to be a Mexican. Critics charged that these programs were superficial and created numerous stereotypes about other cultures.

Second, some culture studies programs were charged with teaching cultural relativism, in which students purportedly learned that one culture was as good as another. Of course, understanding others did not necessarily mean agreement with the cultural traditions or with the ideological, political and economic system of other nations. For instance, it was quite possible to appreciate Chinese culture without agreeing with the excesses of the People's Republic of China. Not all cultural studies programs made this distinction, and the charge of cultural relativism soon emerged. Some culture studies programs felt that their role was not to judge other cultures, but to understand them. Critics felt that, if culture studies programs were to be offered, courses should include reference to the other nations' abuses of political and human rights. These issues have remained unresolved and have resurfaced regularly since the creation of culture studies programs.

A major setback beset the field when Congress failed to appropriate funds for the International Education Act in 1966. The Ford Foundation, in premature expectation of the passage of this legislation, eliminated its support for area studies centers which had amounted to more than 300 million dollars. Simultaneously, support for the centers was reduced through reductions in federal funding of the international education component of NDEA. Many area studies centers were dramatically cut back, and some were eliminated due to the retrenchment in federal and foundation funding. While these events affected collegiate international studies education, only minor direct effects were felt in pre-collegiate programs.

In addition to the continuing influences of the approaches noted in the previous decades, three additional trends influenced international education activities during the 1960s. These were (1) the continuation of a process of localization of international education programs; (2) the increased leadership role of education organizations, such as the National Council for Social Studies; and (3) the massive federal funding of new curriculum materials under Project Social

Studies of the National Science Foundation. There were also important contributions via various U.S. Office of Education programs, particularly the Bureau of Research during that period.

The first trend was the creation of effective local and regional programs. For instance, in 1964, the New York State Education Department created the Center for International and Comparative Education. With U.S. Office of Education funds, the center established a center in India, and hundreds of New York State teachers traveled to India, and other third world countries, through the center's programs. During the late 1960s, regional efforts emerged housed at colleges and universities. For instance, the Center for Teaching International Education was started at the University of Denver in 1968. The center's early efforts were focused almost entirely upon teacher education programs throughout the Rocky Mountain States. Succeeding directors developed a publications program, university courses for teachers and a Masters Degree Program for teachers.

As the North Central Association's Foreign Relations Project wound down, the Foreign Policy Association (FPA) expanded its interest in pre-collegiate education. In 1964, FPA created the School Services Division, which was funded by grants from the Ford Foundation, and later the Danforth Foundation. In addition to developing several sets of curriculum materials,⁸ it also established regional offices which worked closely with educators. The U.S. Office of Education funded the FPA to report upon the state of international education in the United States.⁹ Authored by James Becker and Lee Anderson, the report provided a basis for the emerging pre-collegiate global and international studies efforts during the following decades. When the foundation and federal funds ran out, the School Services program was eliminated in 1972.¹⁰ However, the influence of its programs continued far beyond its publications and reports. Many subsequent leaders in the global and international studies field were influenced directly and indirectly by FPA's efforts in the late 1960s.

A second major trend was the involvement of national education organizations in the field. For example, the National Council for Social Studies supported the development of a world affairs program in Glens Falls, New York.¹¹ Its 1968 yearbook focused upon the international dimensions of social studies,¹² as have several issues of its journal, *Social Education*. Numerous presentations at conferences beginning in the 1960s, included theoretical discussions and practical sessions on teaching international studies in the classroom. Other education organizations issued publications and held conferences with international themes, including the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Education Commission of the States.¹³ Other educational projects were housed in non-profit organizations such as the Institute for World Order and the Overseas

Development Council.¹⁴ School programs of these organizations mainly focused upon teacher education efforts, and often included specific value dimensions.

The third trend was federal support for the development of curriculum materials. Beginning with the National Science Foundation's funding of "Man: A Course of Study,"¹⁵ the federal government funded numerous university-based projects which developed curriculum materials, and conducted training institutes for pre-collegiate educators. These projects were based usually upon the content of specific academic disciplines which often included international content, and usually emphasized a top down model of school change. University specialists knew the content of their discipline, and the purpose of elementary and secondary schools was to teach this content. Much of this content was in fact international.¹⁶ Across the nation federally funded summer workshops and institutes were conducted by colleges and universities for pre-collegiate educators. These educators learned what, and how, to teach. Moreover, the teachers who attended the summer institutes in turn trained other teachers on the basis of what they learned from the university professors.

It is interesting to note that the demise of the National Science Foundation funded curriculum projects in the 1970s can, in part, be attributed to the charge of cultural relativism with regard to the most successfully funded project, "Man: A Course of Studies." This project intended to bring anthropological skills and approaches into the upper elementary classroom, and had several components about other cultures. By some estimates, components of the course had been incorporated into almost half the elementary classrooms in the nation, when critics charged that the course taught humanism and cultural relativism.

The Vietnam Period and the Emergence of International Studies and Global Issues in the 1970s

Despite lack of funding for the International Education Act passed in 1966, the steep reduction in foundation funding of international studies, and the leveling off of federal appropriations for Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, the 1970's proved to be a period of growth and diversification. Area studies programs which were initially launched at colleges and universities in the 1930s and flowered in the 1960s through a combination of generous foundation support and substantial federal funding through NDEA Title VI, began to significantly influence pre-collegiate education through federally mandated outreach programs. These outreach programs developed curriculum materials and conducted workshops for teachers.¹⁷ For instance, the Bay Area China Project, and its successor, the Stanford Program on International Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), was supported through several area studies centers at Stanford University.¹⁸ SPICE developed curriculum materials and conducted teacher

education programs cooperatively with San Francisco Bay area school districts. Several other outreach programs of the language and area studies centers have contributed to the international education field. Many other organizations have supported non-western area studies programs. International organizations (such as UNESCO and the World Bank), community organizations (such as the Asia Society and the African-American Institute), and governmental agencies (such as the Agency for International Development) have all contributed to pre-collegiate interest in the developing world.

Already inherent within the work of James Becker and Lee Anderson was a major new approach to international education, which was the study of global issues. While the study of global issues had been underway in colleges and universities much earlier, visibility for it gained major impetus after the Arab oil boycott which began in 1973. Many other global issues emerged from a plethora of studies conducted during the 1960s and 1970s, such as the reports of the Club of Rome, and Dennis Meadows's, *The Limits of Growth*.¹⁹ Global issues included environment, migratory pollution, national security, nuclear war, peace, disarmament, human rights, development, international trade, world population growth, and issues related to food and hunger.

Unlike the area studies approach, which emanated almost entirely from college and university centers, the interest in global issues has largely come from community groups. Many non-profit organizations championed specific causes or issues, and have lobbied to include them within the school curriculum. Some groups were focused upon single issues and often did not see the relationship with other global issues. Other groups were not only advocates for particular issues; they were also advocates for particular positions regarding the solution to a global issue. Serious questions regarding global issues were mainly curriculum add-ons, and, in some cases, replaced traditional courses which were rapidly decreasing throughout the country. Many global issues became the basis for elective courses which influenced few students. Neither the area studies nor the global issues approach dealt effectively with the content coverage issue. In many ways, these approaches exacerbated this problem by adding more content to an already crowded curriculum. The experience of many advocates of a particular issue or topic taught that whoever exercised political power could influence the school's curriculum. The study of global issues in the curriculum often ended up as a disorganized mess.

During the early 1970s diversity, which had been the major characteristic of international studies education, was questioned. The Education Commission of the International Studies Association, the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association and the Center for War/Peace Studies

teamed up to develop a series of four pamphlets on international education. In the words of Richard C. Snyder:

For too long, too many different individuals, groups, and organizations attempting to "improve international understanding" have gone their particularistic, uncoordinated, and competitive ways.²⁰

It was time for a more systematic and comprehensive approach to international studies. After a period of experimentation, many educators felt that new principles were needed in order to help determine what to include and exclude in the already crowded curriculum. Obviously, not all areas of the world could, or should be taught to the same extent; not all global issues could be included in the curriculum; and not all world history or geography could be covered. Even when a subject was taught, the question emerged as to what depth would be appropriate for pre-collegiate education. In part, international and global pre-collegiate education was an amalgamation that included traditional educators interested in world geography, world history, and international relations courses, area studies educators, and those interested in global issues.

Four major factors contributed to the national leadership of the field during the 1970s. The first was the Center for War/Peace Studies, which coined the term "global perspectives" and, in 1976, changed its name to Global Perspectives in Education. The second was a series of initiatives from the U.S. Office of Education's Institute of International Studies. The third was the creation of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, launched by President Carter in 1977. The fourth was the establishment of the Citizens' Education for Cultural Understanding program in the U.S. Office of Education that provided funds directly to pre-collegiate global and international studies education.

The Center for War/Peace Studies; Global Perspectives in Education. The Center for War/Peace Studies,²¹ created in the late 1960s, focused exclusively upon the task of international education at the pre-collegiate level. Its initial educational program was to support the Diablo Valley Education Project in the San Francisco Bay area under the direction of Robert Freeman. Later, the center assumed responsibility for FPA's publication, Intercom, and some staff from FPA's School Services division joined the center's staff and were instrumental in launching the center's early national education efforts.

The National Endowment for the Humanities made a major grant to the Center for War/Peace Studies to help conceptualize the new field. This project produced 14 curriculum units with practical applications to the classroom. The project also established regional efforts in eight states; many individuals connected

with these regional efforts continued to influence international education throughout the 1970s and 1980s.

For the project, Robert Hanvey developed a short paper, "An Attainable Global Perspective," which galvanized thinking about the field in a way that no single previous document did. He presented five "global perspectives"—perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics and awareness of human choices—as curriculum organizers.²² The project also developed four concepts: conflict, interdependence, communication, and change.²³ The advantage of these broad perspectives and concepts was their general applicability to the entire curriculum. These concepts could be understood even by elementary school children, and could be infused into traditional secondary school courses. These concepts could also be applied to disciplines other than social studies. Specific content could be selected by local schools and classroom teachers.

As important as these perspectives and concepts were, there was no agreed upon, definitive list of concepts which should be included in the curriculum. The concepts offered tended to be ambiguously defined, and generally overlapping in scope. No attempt has been made to map these concepts or to explore the relationship among them, and no criteria have been offered to help judge which concepts should be included in the curriculum. Finally, little research has been conducted which suggests where these concepts would best fit in the curriculum.

U.S. Office of Education's Institute of International Studies. The second was a wide range of initiatives launched at the beginning of the decade by the recently established Institute under the leadership of Robert Leestma. High points included redirection of the NDEA Title VI program, in part to provide and ensure continuing assistance to elementary and secondary education needs within available resources by requiring university center recipients to devote an amount equal to 15% of their NDEA center grant for such purposes. New international programs were established with other than the traditional language and area focus to help strengthen general education and teacher education at the undergraduate level.

Among other relevant initiatives, a Group Projects Abroad program category was created which funded international opportunities during the summer, particularly for teachers, curriculum specialists, administrators, and teacher educators. Special attention was given to helping chief state school officers broaden their international horizons and learn from first hand experience in field seminars abroad how adequately their state systems were dealing with the non-Western world.

The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. The international education activity in the 1970s culminated in the creation by President Carter of the Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. In 1979 the Commission issued a major report on the state of foreign language competence and knowledge of international affairs, which included a major focus upon pre-collegiate international education.²⁴ The effects of the commission's activities upon pre-collegiate education were several. For the first time, foreign language educators and pre-collegiate international studies educators worked together to influence the report of the commission. Second, several state commissions on foreign language and international studies were created, many of which influenced state programs during the next decade. Third, out of the commission emerged the National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies. The council developed several publications²⁵ and conducted numerous public activities including working with business, congressional and educational leaders.

The Citizens' Education for Cultural Understanding Program. The U.S. Office of Education's support of international education increased and broadened through the passage and funding of the field-initiated Citizens' Education for Cultural Understanding,²⁶ an important but short-lived (1979-81) section of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. Over thirty projects per year were funded throughout the United States. Many projects have continued to survive. For instance, Florida International University's program, directed by Jan Tucker, was launched by funds from this program, and has survived and thrived in Dade County Public Schools during the intervening years.

Localization of Global and International Studies Education. The field continued to strengthen at the local level, encouraged by federal and other funding sources. The Mershon Center at Ohio State University developed a pre-collegiate education program under the guidance of Richard Remy. The center has developed materials and engaged in teacher education, particularly in Ohio. Richard Remy has made numerous contributions through several national publications.²⁷

Other regional programs blossomed. During the early 1970s, James Becker established the Mid-America Center for Global Perspectives in Education in Bloomington, Indiana, with support from the Lilly Endowment. The center conducted numerous activities throughout a five-state region. The center's contributions included the popularization of the "Your Community in the World" programs originally developed by Chad Alger at the Mershon Center at Ohio State University.²⁸ These projects have readily lent themselves to application through-

out the country and by the end of the 1980s over fifty communities and states developed teaching materials.²⁹

A second contribution of the Mid-America Center was the publication of *Schooling in a Global Age*, which brought together the best thinking about global education up to that time.³⁰ In the book, James Becker presented three views of global education: the world affairs or foreign policy studies view, the world cultures or area studies view, and the world-centered education view. World-centered education was more than just the study of area studies and foreign policy studies, and included a different approach to the study of content, and a delineation of the skills and attitudes students would need to respond effectively to this world.

Global Education and Economic Interdependence in the 1980s and 1990s

Many of the trends, already underway in previous decades, continued in the 1980s and 1990s. Regionalization was dramatically enhanced as foundations supported local and regional efforts. For instance, the Danforth Foundation made grants in support of dozens of local and regional global and international education projects.³¹ Most projects incorporated collaborative dimensions among local colleges and universities, schools and school districts and community organizations and foundations.

Several new dimensions have dramatically altered the field during the last decade. These included the strengthening of traditional social studies subjects, such as Geography, the attempt to add international dimensions to the non-social studies curriculum of schools, the critical appraisal of global education, the creation of new organizations, and the development of new conceptualizations for the field.

The Strengthening of Traditional Social Studies Subjects. The report, *A Nation at Risk*, popularized the need strengthen the traditional school curriculum. With S.A.T. scores declining, and other concerns about the schools rising, the report arrived at a propitious moment. As a result of this report, and the hundreds of subsequent national, state and local commissions and committees spawned by the report, high school graduation requirements and other academic mandates increased dramatically throughout the nation. A renewed support for the teaching of world history and geography was encouraged by these national trends.

Geography, largely absent from the curriculum of the schools in the 1970s, received a major new impetus as surveys reported on the woeful ignorance of American youth about the world. The National Geographic Society established a

foundation which emphasized the teaching of geography in elementary and secondary schools. Today, geographic collaboratives are underway throughout many states.

Other organizations, such as the Atlantic Council and its Working Group on the Successor Generation, strongly encouraged the teaching about Western Europe.³²

The Non-Social Studies Dimensions of Global and International Studies Education. Several new cooperative ventures emerged from the work of the President's Commission. For the first time, pre-collegiate foreign language and international studies educators worked together. This cooperation included both political support for legislative programs as well as applications of curriculum activities in the schools.

In addition to working with foreign language educators, several new programs were created in other disciplines. Many global and international issues are also related to topics normally covered in non-social studies courses. For instance, the science curriculum includes issues related to the environment, ecology, nuclear physics, and pollution. Foreign language courses discuss at least the specific culture and history of the language group; oftentimes the study of a language helps students understand culture and history in general. Mathematics problems can easily include statistical problems related to population growth rates, and currency exchange rates or other figures include international content. Cultural understanding can be achieved through the study of the literature, music and art forms of other peoples.³³

The Critical Appraisal of Global Education Programs. As to be expected in any eclectic movement, the global and international studies education field is broadly based and includes individuals of different political and educational perspectives. These differences have led to tensions. On the whole, however, these tensions have strengthened the field.

During the 1980s several critical views challenged the global education field. Many people believe that the most important values to be taught in the schools are patriotic love of one's country and commitment to this nation's leadership responsibilities in the world.³⁴ While many critics believe that patriotism is not incompatible with an international consciousness, some believe that many global education programs deny moral absolutes, are skewed toward the left-wing political positions, and promote "one worldism."

Most issues related to international and global studies are non-controversial. A basic knowledge of other countries, a general knowledge of geography, or an understanding of American foreign policy is non-controversial. However, some topics are controversial and the schools are confronted with either avoiding them, or attempting to deal with them responsibly. While controversial issues are not unique to the field of international and global education, problems related to values and attitudes surface regularly.

Most global education leaders maintain that a balanced approach is essential if controversial issues are to be incorporated within the curriculum of public elementary and secondary schools. This balanced approach includes the appropriate presentation of mainstream views about all topics raised in the curriculum.

The Creation of the Alliance of Educators for Global and International Studies. In September 1986, a group of education leaders met in Wingspread, Wisconsin, to explore the creation of a general umbrella organization for the different elements of the field. After extended discussions over the succeeding year, the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies (AEGIS) was launched in the fall of 1987. One crucial task that AEGIS tackled was the difficulties related to values and the teaching of controversial issues in the classroom. AEGIS has drafted standards for promoting a balanced approach to controversial issues.³⁵

New Conceptualizations. Additional attempts to pull together a wide range of international and global content have recently been made. Chad Alger and James Harf, who have political science and international relations backgrounds, have offered a system of organizing a global education content. They have developed a model with five elements: values, transactions (political, military, social, economic), actors, procedures and mechanisms, and global issues.³⁶

Building on the work of arts and humanities, Willard Kniep has offered a broader organization of global education content. Kniep organizes the content of global education into four major domains: the domain of human values and cultures, the domain of global systems (economic, ecological and technological), the domain of global issues and problems, and the domain of global history.³⁷

These conceptualizations have attempted to move away from a fuzzy collection of goals, and objectives, with hundreds of special interest groups pleading for the inclusion of a particular geographic area or global issue, toward a more systematic and comprehensive approach.

Global and International Studies Education for the 1990s

During the past four decades global and international studies education moved from the periphery into the mainstream of American elementary and secondary education. Hundreds of global and international studies projects³⁸ launched teacher education programs and published thousands of articles, books and supplemental curriculum materials.³⁹ Many colleges and universities conducted teacher in-service courses with international dimensions,⁴⁰ and national education organizations issued publications and sponsored conferences.⁴¹ Eight national commissions and studies reported specifically on the state of international competence of American youth, and most of the over 400 education reports published since *A Nation at Risk* include international dimensions. Most of these reports issued recommendations on how international studies and foreign language programs should be implemented in the nation's schools.⁴² Additionally, there are dozens of textbook reviews, doctoral dissertations, research investigations and evaluation studies.⁴³ Rationales, frameworks, and lists of goals and objectives abound which take on the task of defining what is meant by global education.⁴⁴ Many state education agencies created commissions, legislated mandates, and offered guidelines supporting global and international studies education goals.⁴⁵ Local school agencies launched over 50 international magnet schools and hundreds of schools have added global and international studies components to their curriculum.⁴⁶

Despite the recent flurry of interest, pre-collegiate global and international studies efforts have ebbed and flowed over the past forty years. The political and ideological motivation for these shifts have varied with perceived national and international crises. Educational applications of these programs have varied based upon educational philosophies. The tensions inherent within widely diverse, occasionally contradictory, and usually unconnected programs, continue to persist today. These tensions are unlikely to disappear under the sheer weight of program activities, and, in fact, are likely to be exacerbated because of this renewed interest and activity.

The future may hinge upon our ability to draw on experiences from the past. As this brief history demonstrates, global and international studies education programs have been dramatically buffeted by international events, and by changing perceptions of national interests. For instance, the end of World War II, the creation of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the emergence of the Cold War, the Vietnam War, the end of colonial empires and the emergence of the developing world, and many more events, have influenced American schools in general, and global and international studies education in particular. However, the schools changed slowly, and often shifts in the schools were out of phase with world events and national shifts in policy. Textbook publishers could not keep up

with the changes and were consistently condemned by academics, educators and those who were liberal and conservative. Teachers were not academically prepared to adjust to these shifts and few financial resources were available from any source to help rectify this condition. Hence the educational changes depended upon committed individuals in schools, colleges and non-profit organizations who attempted to rectify these conditions.

While the need for global and international studies education is generally accepted, there is no agreement as to what it means, or how this need can be implemented in our nation's schools. During the past decade some progress has been made on specific topics. However, global and international educators will not continue the progress noted over the past decade unless the following types of questions are answered: What are the priorities? What should be known and understood by all students? What should be known by students who will continue their studies in college and graduate school? With the limited time available in the curriculum, what should be emphasized? How are these programs to be effectively implemented during a period of financial limitations? How are these programs to be evaluated?

There is no expectation that these questions will be adequately answered soon, but more systematic and comprehensive approaches to them are needed for the 1990s. Despite the needs, and the promises of global and international studies educational programs at the elementary and secondary school level, there are currently few financial resources available for these efforts. Few federal programs or private foundations currently fund the type of activities now needed if progress is to be made. States and school districts are unlikely to fund major new programs due to budgetary constraints. Without adequate funding, piecemeal low budget efforts are likely to continue for the foreseeable future similar to the type of efforts pursued in the past.

Notes

1. See Byron G. Massialas, *Education and the Political System* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969), p. 2.
2. Richard Remy, *Handbook of Basic Citizenship Competencies* (Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, nd).
3. See R. Freeman Butts, *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century* (Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1988).
4. For example, see Herbert J. Abraham, *World Problems in the Classroom* (Paris: UNESCO, 1973); and Thomas Buergenthal and Judith V. Torney, *International Human Rights and International Education* (Washington, DC: Department of State, 1976).

5. The American Field Service subsequently changed its name to AFS Intercultural Programs.
6. A comprehensive list of international exchange organizations and activities can be located in the Council on Standards for International Educational Travel's *Advisory List of International Educational and Exchange Programs, 1988* (Reston, VA: CSIET, 1988). Classroom materials another references can be found in Global Education and International Exchange, in *Intercom #106* (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1985).
7. For an evaluation of the international component of NDEA, see Lorraine M. McDonnell, Sue E. Berryman, and Douglas Scott, *Federal Support for International Studies: The Role of NDEA Title VI* (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1981).
8. For example, "Dangerous Parallel," "Using Newspapers in the Classroom," "Using Games and Simulations in the Classrooms," and *Intercom* magazine published by the Foreign Policy Association prior to 1970.
9. See James Becker, *An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary School*, which is available through ERIC Number: ED026933 24 FL001217.
10. The Foreign Policy Association resumed its school services program in 1983.
11. See *Improving the Teaching of World Affairs: The Glens Falls Story* (Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies, 1964); and *Bringing World Affairs into the Classroom: Gleanings from Glens Falls* (Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies, 1968).
12. See Howard Mehlinger and James Becker, eds., *International Dimensions in the Social Studies* (Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies, 1968).
13. See previously cited materials by Ward Morehouse, and by Harold Taylor.
14. The education program of the Institute for World Order was headed by Betty Reardon. The Overseas Development Council's education effort was headed by Jayne Millar Wood.
15. See Peter Dow, *Man: A Course of Study—Talks to Teachers* (Cambridge, MA: Education Development Center, Inc., 1968).
16. See Gary R. Smith and John H. Spurgin, *Global Dimensions in the Social Studies* (Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1973).
17. With funding from the Ford Foundation, area studies centers were launched at several colleges and universities during the 1930s. These efforts were expanded after World War II as the Ford Foundation increased its financial contributions, and other foundations, such as the Carnegie Corporation, began to fund new area studies programs. As decolonization spread throughout Africa and Asia, it was evident that America lacked the intellectual expertise to deal with these areas of the world. Federal funding for language and area studies centers was built into the National Defense in Education Act (NDEA). Almost all of the funds for area studies went to college and university programs.

18. For an example of a publication developed by SPICE, see *Demystifying the Chinese Language* (Denver, CO: Center for Teaching International Relations, 1983).
19. See Dennis Meadows et al., *The Limits of Growth* (New York: Universe Book, 1972); and Lester Brown et al., *State of the World*, published annually by the World Watch Institute (New York: W.W. Norton). The work of Don Lesh and the Global Tomorrow Coalition is also of particular significance during the past decade. The responsibilities of the schools regarding advocating positions on particular global issues emerged, see specifically Walter Corson, ed. *Citizen's Guide to Sustainable Development* (Washington, DC: GTC, 1989).
20. Richard S. Snyder, in his introduction to *Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The Elementary School* (New York: Center for War/Peace Studies, 1972). Other pamphlets in the series focused upon the university, secondary schools and the community.
21. In 1988, Global Perspectives in Education merged with the National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies to create The American Forum for Global Education.
22. See Robert Hanvey, "An Attainable Global Perspective," An Occasional Paper (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1975).
23. David C. King, Margaret S. Branson, and Larry E. Condon, "Education for a World in Change; A Working Handbook for Global Perspectives," in *Intercom #84/5* (New York: Center for Global Perspectives, 1976), p. 17; and David C. King, "Education for a World in Change: A Report," in *Intercom #96/7* (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1980).
24. See James Perkins et al., *Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1979), and a companion volume of background studies. These materials are available through ERIC.
25. See for example, *Internationalizing Your School: A Handbook & Resource Guide for Teachers, Administrators, Parents and School Board Members*, authored by Frank Rosengren, Marylee Crofts Wiley and David S. Wiley (New York: National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies, 1983); and *Children and Languages: Research, Practice, and Rationale for the Early Grades*, compiled by Rosemarie Benya and edited by Kurt E. Muller (New York: National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies, 1988).
26. This was renamed the International Understanding Program in 1980.
27. For instance, see Richard Remy et al., *International Learning and International Education in a Global Age* (Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies, 1975).
28. Chad Alger's "Columbus and the World" project started as a research program to map international linkages of local communities. This was picked up by the Kettering Foundation who developed a project in Findley, Ohio. See William P. Shaw and Edwin P. McClain, *The Findlay Story* (Kettering, OH: Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1979).
29. For example, see the *Your Community in the World* (Springfield, IL: State Board of Education, nd.); Susan Irby et al., *Georgia and the World; the World and Georgia* (Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1983).

30. James M. Becker, ed, *Schooling in a Global Age* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1979).
31. These grants were discontinued by the Danforth Foundation in 1988.
32. See Edmund D. Pellegrino et al., *The Successor Generation: Its Challenges and Responsibilities* (Washington, DC: The Atlantic Council, 1981) and *The Teaching of Values and the Successor Generation* (Washington, DC: The Atlantic Council, 1983).
33. For mathematics, see Richard Schwartz, *Mathematics and Global Survival* (Needham, MA: Ginn Press, 1989). For science, see David Haury et al., "Preparing Science Teachers with a Global Perspective" in *ACCESS* Nos. 72-3, September-October, 1987, pp. 5-10, and Frederick Staley, "Reforming the Science Curriculum with a Global Perspective," in Willard Kniep, ed. *Next Steps in Global Education*, ibid, pp. 159-171. For foreign language education, see Thomas H. Geno, ed. *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration* (Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1981); and Maurice Conner, *A Global Approach to Foreign Language Education* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1981).
34. See, Gregg L. Cunningham, "Blowing the Whistle on 'Global Education'" Mimeograph, U.S. Department of Education Region VIII, (Denver, CO: nd.); Chester E. Finn, Jr., and Gary Bauer, "Globaloney," *American Spectator*, May, 1986; Katherine Kersten, *The "Radicalization" of Minnesota's Public School Curriculum: The Case of Central America* (Minneapolis, MN: The Minnesota Association of Scholars, 1988); Minnesota Department of Education, "Need for Balancing Points of View: Learning From Our Experience" in *ACCESS* #83 published by The American Forum, December 1989; Albert Shanker, "Where We Stand, Which Way Global Education? Propaganda or Education?" *The New York Times*, February 19, 1989.
35. Charter Drafting Committee for the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies, "Goals and Values" (Mimeographed paper), n.d.
36. See Chadwick Alger and James Harf, "Global Education: Why? For Whom? About What?" (mimeograph paper) The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1985.
37. See Willard Kniep, "Defining a Global Education by its Content" in *Social Education*, October, 1986, p. 437; available through the National Council for Social Studies.
38. For a description of international education programs in the 1970s, see the *Directory of Resources in Global Education*, developed by the Interorganizational Commission of International/Intercultural Education (Washington, DC: Overseas Development Council, 1977); and Fred Czarra, ed. *The Social Studies: Directory of Resources, Global International Education* (Washington, DC, Heldref Publications, 1979). For descriptions of the global education programs during the 1980's, see *The New Global Yellow Pages* (New York: The American Forum, 1989).
39. For a description of materials, see *International Education Resources: A Summary of OE-Funded Research Projects and Reports Available through ERIC: 1956-71* (Washington, DC: H.E.W., Office of Education, 1972); *The New Global Resource Book* (New York: The American Forum, 1990); and *Global Education Catalog* (Culver City, CA: Social Studies School Services, 1990).

40. For instance, see Harold Taylor, *The World and the American Teacher* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1969); Anna S. Ochoa, "Internationalizing Teacher Education," in Robert E. Freeman, ed., *Promising Practices in Global Education: A Handbook with Case Studies* (New York: National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies, 1986); see also, *Change Magazine's Education and the World View Project*.

41. For instance, the annual conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education (1985) focused upon international education, as did the conference of the Council of Chief State School Officers (1985), and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1989). For examples of publications, see Catherine Williams, "International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: A Policymaker's Guide," (Arlington, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1986); H. Thomas Collins and Sally Banks Zakariya, *Getting Started in Global Education: A Primer for Principals and Teachers* (Arlington, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1982); Howard Mehlinger et al., *Global Studies for American Schools* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, nd).

42. For example, in addition to other reports cited in this paper, see Clark Kerr et al., *The United States Prepares for its Future: Global Perspectives in Education* (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1987); Southern Governors' Association report: *International Education: Cornerstone of Competition* (Washington, DC: 1986); the reports on international education by the National Governors' Association (Washington, DC: 1987) and their Report of the Taskforce on International Education, *America in Transition—the International Frontier* (Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, 1989); Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies, *International Competence: A Key to America's Future* (Washington, DC: CAFLIS, 1989).

43. See Judith Torney-Purta, ed., *Evaluating Global Education: Sample Instruments for Assessing Programs, Materials and Learning* (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1986).

44. Willard Kniep, "A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities," An Occasional Paper (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1985).

45. For examples of state activities see, Ward Morehouse, *State Leadership in International Education*, Report No. 14 (Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1969); the report of the Council of Chief State School Officers *International Dimensions of Education* (Washington, DC: CCSSO, 1985); Dorka Keehn, ed. *Global, International and Foreign Language Education: 1988-89 State Profiles* (New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, 1989).

46. For a description of school-based global education programs, see *Education at the Grass Roots* (New York: Council on International and Public Affairs, 1984); for a list of International High Schools, see ACCESS #77-8, March-April 1988.

Global Education and Controversy: Some Observations

Robert K. Fullinwider

Global education has always had its detractors, but recent controversies have raised criticism to a new level of visibility and intensity. I am not going to address the particulars of any controversy. I think it is more profitable to dwell not on the most egregious sins of this or that particular educational program but to look at what it is about global education *in general* that makes reasonable people skittish and worried.

Everyone agrees that American students need to be better acquainted with the world. They need more languages, more history, more geography, more cultural exposure. Why, then, is there controversy about a movement for enriching the curriculum in these ways? There is controversy because "global education" names not just those who want to increase international studies in the curriculum. It names a movement that uses a special language, and this language—or, rather, the loose use of it—gets global education in hot water. In particular, it gets global education charged with promoting moral relativism and undermining national citizenship.

Let's talk first about citizenship. The avowed aim of global education is to generate in students a "global perspective,"¹ in which they "recognize [their] common citizenship in the world community."² Talk about "citizenship" in a world community or "world citizenship" can be harmless enough, and not carry any special freight with it. But some will take this language to imply an antagonism between global education and traditional conceptions of national citizenship. This is not an unreasonable inference. After all, the idea of citizen,

when it arose in the Greek city-states, designated those who had full and equal privileges in the ruling of the state, in contrast to visitors, resident aliens, slaves, and others, whose rights and privileges were limited and partial. A citizen of a nation still is thought of as one who has full membership in it and who stands in a special relationship to fellow citizens. To speak, thus, of "world citizenship" seems to suggest that each person stands to all others in the *world* as a *political* equal, deserving that his interests be accorded equal weight in deliberation. This apparent broadening of the civic tie would seem to weaken, if not abolish, the special tie of national citizenship.

This idea is reinforced when we ask about the "global perspective" and its role. Here is what some global educationists say about the global perspective:

It provides a perspective "which reconciles the various conflicting interests and entities who necessarily share the same earth. . . ." ³

It means acquiring a "worldwide moral landscape." ⁴

It is "a world view—seeing oneself as members of a single species on a small planet. . . ." ⁵

It is a perspective that students should make the basis of their personal value systems.⁶

These statements don't give us a precise grip on the global perspective, but they do seem to picture a point of view in which local and parochial ties and commitments are downplayed in favor of solutions that favor all persons equally. We are to view ourselves not as Lutherans or Frenchmen, Americans or Social Democrats, but as "members of a single species"—as humans. The various differences among us that might ordinarily take on political significance are apparently submerged in a global point of view.

Global education's frequent and facile references to "world citizenship" and its promotion of a deliberative perspective that seems to view humans as relatively undifferentiated certainly could prompt any reasonable person to ask how global education is compatible with the creation or promotion of national patriotism and how it makes a place for the special loyalties and commitments that characterize local and national attachments. A parent could have legitimate concerns about global education's message.

The "Statement of Goals and Values" of the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies (AEGIS) takes note of this concern and tries to allay it:

We recognize that promoting a sense of responsibility that crosses ideological, cultural, and national boundaries is a complex and controversial undertaking. For some, a sense of world responsibility seems to require abandonment of a commitment to one's own nation. For others, a commitment to one's own nation precludes the pursuit of world responsibilities. We affirm the wisdom—indeed the necessity—of a commitment to both one's own nation and the world.

AEGIS deals with the concern by affirming *both* nation and world. Well, it is indeed always the better part of wisdom to have your cake and eat it too—if you can. Whether you can, though, is precisely the question here.

AEGIS's attempt to address the concern about global education's commitments follows a well-worn path, one pioneered by many previous global educators who have insisted that there is no conflict between the loyalties entailed by simultaneous national and world citizenship. One educator believes it is self-evident that "it is possible to maintain harmonious membership in family, church, local community groups, the nation, transnational groups, and in humankind generally," and if this fact is not evident to some, the mission of global education is to create more people holding this view of harmony.⁷

Another chides critics for failing to realize that "loyalty is an infinite quality. A person can possess strong loyalties to family, school, church, community, state, and nation and still be loyal to concerns and issues that transcend national boundaries."⁸ And Carole Hahn, in her presidential address to the National Council for the Social Studies in the mid-80s, said:

We will have to convince people that national loyalty and national identity will not be sacrificed. Just as being a citizen of the United States does not diminish my citizenship in Decatur, Georgia, neither will my national citizenship be sacrificed to a global identification.⁹

Hahn's example actually works against any assurance that multiple loyalties can easily coexist. She seems to have forgotten that there was a time in which the question *did* arise about the ultimate compatibility of Georgia citizenship and United States citizenship; and the question was settled by a bloody civil war. The reason citizenship now in Decatur—or in Dallas, Denver, or Danbury—is not incompatible with citizenship in the United States is because Decatur is a "nested" community, legally a part of the United States and so having legal recourse to protect itself against substantial damage to its interests by the nation and legal power to share in the benefits to the whole country. There is no fundamental opposition of interests between Decatur and the United States, but this fact is not a "natural" fact, it is a "contrived" one: that is, it is the product of special

institutional arrangements that *establish* a convergence of local and national interests.

These special institutional arrangements generate a convergence in two ways. First, legal and institutional protections prevent other communities, or the nation as a whole, from seriously exploiting Decatur for their own good. For example, in raising an army, the United States cannot elect to concentrate its conscription on Georgia while immunizing Kansas, Oregon, Mississippi, and other states. Burdens are required to be spread fairly.

Second, because Decatur is so thoroughly integrated into American culture, its inhabitants will be raised to have desires and interests largely similar to and compatible with those of other members of the United States. So in these two ways—by training people to have similar and compatible desires to start with and by accordinng a great deal of self-rule and legal protection to local interests—the common government and culture of the United States make it easy for Carole Hahn to maintain her multiple loyalties without having to sacrifice one to the other.

In the *absence* of institutional arrangements that accomplish a convergence or harmony of interests, multiple loyalties can be precarious and sources of severe conflict. This is plain enough to us when we have two close friends who fall out and become irreconcilable enemies. We may find ourselves caught in the middle and ultimately forced to choose sides. A person's multiple loyalties can co-exist comfortably only where by accident or design serious conflict doesn't arise among the objects of his loyalty. When serious conflict does arise, the loyalties have to be ordered in some way, some loyalties taking priority over others.

There is no controversy about having simultaneous loyalties to the United States and to transnational or international groups as long as the legitimate interests of the United States and those other groups are not seriously divergent. Serious and tragic conflict is a genuine possibility, however, in a world which as a whole does not exist under institutional arrangements that successfully moderate differences of interest or adjudicate them justly. When serious conflict does arise, there will be a strain on our multiple loyalties that forces us to think about what weight we shall give to each.

And this is the crux of the matter when we wonder about global education's implications for citizenship and loyalty. What *kinds* of responsibilities toward the world at large are we as individuals encouraged to take on by global education, and what *weight* are we supposed we give to our own nation's interests when we take up the global perspective for thinking about issues?

We can put Carole Hahn's example to work again here. If global education's view is that national citizenship should stand to "world citizenship" as Decatur citizenship stands to U.S. citizenship, then global education is proposing a very considerable weakening of the weight we give to national citizenship; for, after all, Decatur citizenship is a very subordinated and attenuated citizenship in relation to U. S. citizenship.

Hahn's attempt to reassure us that we can maintain both national and world citizenship without sacrifice of either brushes over the crucial role of institutions in creating the conditions for a harmony of interests. The problem about the world order—or rather, *lack* of world order—is not, as the one global educator thought, to create more people who believe in harmony, but to create more world institutions that bring about harmony. If the fuzzy and inexact talk about world citizenship and global perspectives is no more than an admonition to American citizens that we be disposed to work for and support institutions that make the world order more harmonious and just, then global education isn't very controversial at all. It asks us only to take seriously the moral universalism that most of us already subscribe to.

Moreover, if the commitments global education asks us to make to the world are *conditional* commitments—that is, commitments to do what we can for others *consistent with* the obligations of our national citizenship—then the compatibility of national and world loyalties is assured. The latter cannot require us to do what would infringe the former. We *can* have our cake and eat it too if we make the right kind of cake. The AEGIS statement edges toward this kind of cake when it acknowledges that its goals are constrained by the existing "distribution and use of power in the world"—an oblique way of referring to the existing institutional order in the world—and when it further urges that our national commitments be "complemented," not supplanted, by growing commitments to extra-national causes.¹⁰

Let me close with a few words on relativism. This issue is such a treacherous and murky swamp that I don't want to lead us very far into it, for fear we will slip entirely out of sight in the quicksand. I want only to give us one or two footholds.

One of global education's leading themes is "respect for cultural diversity." Unfortunately, global education material sometimes goes about this aim in confusing ways. A CTIR *Teacher Resource Guide*, for example, poses this question: "Do we sometimes have a tendency to define our values and behaviors as 'right' or 'correct' and determine that others' values and behaviors are 'wrong' or 'weird'? Is any one person or culture 'right' or 'wrong'?"¹¹ This last question is, of course, entirely rhetorical: we are supposed automatically to answer "no."

Now, it is not hard to see what is being gotten at here in a muddled sort of way: students are being warned away from the vice of *judgmentalism*, the vice of judging others by their superficial similarities or dissimilarities to the judge. Unfortunately, this all-too-frequently used rhetorical relativism seems to warn us away from judgmentalism by warning us away from *judgment* altogether. If no one is ever "right" or "correct," who is to judge? No one! What, then, is to ground the "respect for diversity" students are supposed to come to have?

Global education materials seldom do a good job explaining why we should respect cultural differences or what that respect amounts to. Difference by itself doesn't deserve respect or tolerance. What deserves respect is the respectable and what deserves tolerance is the tolerable. Properly responding to differences with respect and tolerance, then, presupposes some prior standpoint from which differences are evaluated. It is important that this fact not be obscured or lost sight of by the various rhetorical devices of relativism or nonjudgmentalism brought in play to avoid that sin of sins for global educators, "ethnocentrism."

Suppose we tell a child that the Eskimos leave their old and infirm members out in the cold to die of exposure. What is she to make of this? If she is in a class emphasizing "cultural diversity," she has already picked up the clue that she is supposed to "respect" the practices she hears about. But why does this practice deserve respect?

Here is where we may teach some very confusing lessons if not careful. The student needs to understand that the act of leaving the old to die is not, among the Eskimos, an act of cruelty, as surely leaving an old person in the cold would be among us. It is not an act of cruelty because of how it fits with the hard and dangerous conditions of Eskimo life and the expectations individual Eskimos have about their duties to the whole group. Now, to assess the Eskimo practice this way is to assess it against the backdrop of a critical standard—one of "our" standards. If the student is told that we can't judge others by "our" standards—it's ethnocentric to do so—then she is left with the idea that the Eskimo practice is okay *regardless* of whether it is cruelty or not, thus okay *even if* it is cruelty. But this is puzzling to her, for how can it be that she should be indifferent to cruelty done by others while sensitive to cruelty done by us? Cruelty is cruelty, isn't it? And against what standard that's not a standard of "ours" does she make her way out of this thicket?

The real issue here is that the broad values in terms of which we unavoidably judge and evaluate moral life—values like respecting human dignity, avoiding cruelty, giving people their due, and so on—are embodied in conventional forms. Our conventions tell us what counts as respect and what doesn't, what a person is due and what not, when causing pain is cruelty and when it isn't. And the world

is full of very different conventions from our own, conventions for realizing most of the same deeper values we share. The danger of judgmentalism flows from our tendency to confuse form with substance and to think that if another society does not share our conventions, it does not share our values—that if, for example, another society does not use juries (which is an instrument we use for justice) it must not believe in justice; and thus it must not prize human dignity.

Global education's concern to develop "respect for cultural diversity" is well-founded. American society to this day is not very cosmopolitan, and Americans all too easily measure the rest of the world against our own conventional forms. Respect for diversity, however, is not achieved by formulas and platitudes that suggest an uncritical view of the practices of others. Such respect can come only from seeing those practices as alternative embodiments of values we share.

Notes

1. Report of the Commission on Global Education (1988), cited in David Brock, "Selling Globaloney in the Schools," *American Spectator*, December 1988), p. 22; Carole Hahn, "Promise and Paradox: Challenge to Global Citizenship," *Social Education* (April 1984), p. 240; James Becker, ed., *Schooling for a Global Age* (New York, 1979), p. xiii; *Guidelines for Global Education* (Lansing: State of Michigan Department of Education, 1978), cited in Collins/Zakariya [see note 2, below], p. 4; U.S. Commissioner of Education's Task Force for a Global Perspective, *Report and Recommendations* (Washington: GPO, 1979), cited in Collins/Zakariya [see note 2 below], p. 4.
2. H. Thomas Collins and Sally Banks Zakariya, *Getting Started in Global Education: A Primer for Principals and Teachers* (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1982), p. 3; Kirk Bergstrom, *World Citizen Curriculum*, 2nd Ed. (CTIR, 1987), p. 4; Bruce R. Joyce and Alexander M. Nicholson, "Imperatives for Global Education," in Becker, p. 104; Hahn, p. 297.
3. Joyce and Alexander, p. 102.
4. Becker, p. xiii.
5. Becker, p. 44.
6. *Guidelines* (Michigan).
7. Becker, p. 43.
8. Collins, p. 18.
9. Hahn, p. 297.

10. Despite its imperfections, the AEGIS statement is on balance a commendable step forward in framing global education's aims in a way that avoids some of the potential controversies I've been discussing.

11. Cited in Brock, p. 23.

*Teaching About the World and Our Nation's Heritage:
The Relationship Between International Education
and Education for American Citizenship*

John Fonte

At the beginning of this decade the American Secretary of State wrote that the nation's schools "have an important role to play" by educating students about the world beyond our borders. "A well-informed citizenry," he asserted, "will support an intelligent and forward-looking foreign policy that advances American interests."¹ In a similar vein, a brief but significant report published several years ago by the National Governors Association (NGA) stated that "knowledge of international history, actors, issues, and languages must be part of every student's education." Moreover, the governors maintained that international education should not be considered "unique" but "part of the preparation for democratic citizenship."² Indeed, the relationship of international education to education for American citizenship has become critical as the nation's schools undergo an increasingly new focus on the teaching and learning of international and global studies. This essay will emphasize three major points: (1) international education is inexorably tied to the teaching and learning of American citizenship; (2) both international education and citizenship education should be consistent with the basic principles of our democratic republic, and certainly with the right of a self-governing free people to affirm and transmit those principles; (3) international and citizenship education are concretely linked because the basic principles of the American heritage are concerned with universal issues that free societies throughout the world will always face.

To begin with, international education, civics, or any other social studies domain must be taught and learned within the context of the American democratic system. Clearly, citizenship education in a constitutional democracy should be founded on liberal democratic principles. The complexities and nuances of education in our democracy have been argued extensively during the 20th century by American scholars such as John Dewey, George Counts, William Heard Kirkpatrick, Sidney Hook, Lawrence Cremin, and more recently, David Cohen, Diane Ravitch, Amy Gutmann and others.³ For the purpose of this short essay, I will argue for the modest proposition that civic and international education in America should be in accord with the deliberative sense of the American people.

The late Sidney Hook reminded us several years ago in his NEH Jefferson lecture that "the first principle of republicanism" (i.e., representative democracy), is *Lex Majoris Partis!*⁴ In other words, the principle of popular sovereignty or some form of majority rule is the necessary condition for a democracy—that is, a self-governing free society—to exist at all. It is a necessary but not, of course, a sufficient condition. Without popular sovereignty or majority rule in some sense—qualified in America by various constitutional constraints, minority rights, federalism, and particularly limited government—one cannot accurately characterize a nation as self-governing or democratic. Obviously this does not mean that education in the American Republic should simply reflect public opinion polls, or that there is necessarily an easy fit between popular opinion and the type of international education that students "need" to function effectively as citizens. As Alexander Hamilton put it in Federalist 71, "The republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they intrust the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests."⁵ In making education policy, a deliberative sense of the community over time—that is to say, something more thoughtful and consensual than simple majority rule—is required. However, after all the qualifications are noted, it is clear that the goals of both citizenship and international education in a democratic society should be, for the most part, in harmony with the predominant ideals and major aspirations of a self-governing free people. Most certainly they should not be in opposition to those ideals and aspirations.

The question "Who decides what is taught in our public schools?" confronts the central issues of legitimacy, authority, and obligation in a democracy. A consensus among professional educators alone certainly is not sufficient to determine the content of the international and civic education curriculum. In a liberal democratic society, professional educators should no more dictate educational policy than medical doctors should dictate health policy or soldiers

dictate national security policy. Citizens as a whole working at the local and state level and, particularly, individual parents, have a legitimate place in decision-making. The growing parental choice movement is a major attempt to address this issue. Needless to say, the expertise of teachers and other professional educators will and should continue to play an important role in shaping policy. As Amy Gutmann has noted, citizens, parents, and professionals all have and indeed deserve a place in educational decisionmaking.⁶

Some of the leaders of the international education field have wrestled with the issue of democratic education and popular sovereignty. Robert Pickus, a prominent global educator for the last several decades, declared that teachers have a responsibility in our democratic society to pass on the values of the community.⁷ If we believe in representative democracy, of course, Pickus is correct. The question then arises: Whose values? Or what values should be transmitted? The answer is those values that we hold in common as Americans. They are not a mystery to ordinary citizens. Every indication from decades of Gallup Polls, surveys on citizenship education, and related matters such as normative attitudes toward national symbols suggests that most Americans favor education that essentially sustains the American polity.⁸ Put otherwise, most Americans tend to look favorably upon a civic and international education that promotes (1) respect for national ideals and traditions; (2) love of country, i.e., patriotism; and (3) the recognition of civic obligations as well as rights.

Hence, before gaining a "global perspective," our students should first have an understanding of what political philosopher Martin Diamond called the "American Heritage," that "bundle of teachings, examples, events, institutions, and documents which together comprise the American political philosophy and experience."⁹ Our democratic republic is based on a constitutional ethos with particular assumptions about self-government, ordered liberty, historical realism, human nature, commerce, the Judeo-Christian tradition, and the interplay of reason and passion in public affairs. Many scholars believe this American vision of ordered liberty has presented an idealistic, yet realistic, prudent, and ameliorative (as opposed to utopian) worldview that has competed successfully—both historically and in the world today—with other world views such as Marxism, monarchy, and popular rule that has been imprudent (for example, French Revolutionary Jacobism).¹⁰ Our young people should study these competing ideas and values, together with the framework of classical American political thinking, particularly the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Federalist Papers and the Gettysburg Address, in a world-historical context.

Unfortunately, we know that our students' knowledge of both American history and the world beyond our shores is inadequate. The work of Ravitch and Finn (1987), Cheney (1987), the National Assessment for Educational Progress

(NAEP) through the 70s and 80s and the 1990 NAEP assessments in history, geography, and civics all reveal considerable weaknesses in student knowledge in both civic and international education.¹¹ Perhaps it is not surprising that after the opening of the Berlin Wall, a series of newspaper articles in the *New York Times*, and the *Washington Post* centered upon student indifference to and incomprehension of the dramatic events that occurred in Eastern Europe.¹²

But if some Americans (adults as well as adolescents) failed to recognize the significance of the anti-communist revolutions of 1989-91, a stream of foreign visitors including a former shipyard worker from Gdansk, and a former playwright from Prague, reminded us that these popular uprisings demonstrated that people everywhere know the difference between freedom and tyranny—and they also know which side the "West" represented in the Cold War. With a bluntness characteristic of former political prisoners, President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia told the U.S. Congress that the past half century was a struggle between "two enormous forces—one a defender of freedom, the other a source of nightmares."¹³ As Vaclav Havel, Lech Walesa, and other notable opponents of totalitarianism make clear, an understanding of the crucial differences between free societies and tyrannies represents a vital conceptual link between citizenship and international education.

Certainly, if American students do not first gain an understanding of (1) the political heritage of our constitutional republic (2) the differences between democratic and undemocratic societies and (3) the reasons for the West's conflict with two different totalitarian systems for the better part of the 20th century, then other social studies concepts such as change, diversity, empathy, and interdependence become weightless and exist in a void without a historical and moral framework. In general, "conceptualization" or the way we organize concepts, issues, and ideas into a coherent curricular framework, has been inadequate in civic education and needs new and careful thinking.

An example from the curriculum framework of one of our largest states is typical of the problem. This framework lists 15 "overarching concepts" as central to obtaining "a global perspective in the social studies." In other words, these 15 concepts represent the crux of civic, social, and international education—what leading curriculum planners believe are the most important ideas that American students need to understand about the modern world. The 15 overarching concepts are:¹⁴

Change	Diversity	Identity	Power
Choice	Empathy	Interdependence	Scarcity
Citizenship	Environment	Justice	Technology
Culture	Human Rights	Political System	

As suggested earlier, missing from this list are political and historical concepts that have affected millions of people throughout the world during the course of the 20th century—democracy and freedom, and of course their opposites—dictatorship and tyranny. Conspicuously absent as well are the crucial concepts of nation, religion, and family that are rooted in historical reality, affect individual lives and mean something to people in ways that concepts such as empathy and change do not. Clearly we have to do a better job conceptually and focus on the most important issues and primary concepts consistent with our heritage and central to events in the world today.

For both citizenship and international education, understanding the essential difference between democratic and undemocratic societies is crucial. Therefore, explicit comparison of the principles and practices of liberal democracies with those of various dictatorships should be examined in the schools. Obviously, comparative analyses should provide perspective and be factual (not propagandistic) and examine the problems as well as the virtues of America and other democracies.

Finally, students should have some understanding of how democracies succeed and fail. Historian Paul Gagnon, in his review of world history textbooks, lamented the fact that instructional materials in secondary schools rarely analyzed the reasons for either the survival or the destruction of various representative governments throughout the 20th century.¹⁵ Indeed, examining this crucial issue (i.e., the successes and failures of democratic systems) requires strengthening post-secondary teacher education. That is to say, college students in schools of education who plan on teaching history, social studies, civics, global studies and the like, should become very familiar with “democracy’s short and troubled tenure in human history” (as the American Federation of Teachers’ *Education for Democracy* booklet put it).¹⁶

In fact, this salient issue of how popular regimes prosper or perish is a perennial one, as old as Aristotle’s *Politics* and as new as this month’s headlines. Significantly, it was this classical problem that faced the Founders of the American constitutional order at the Philadelphia convention in 1787. The Founders, realizing that historically many (indeed most) popular regimes had slid into disorder and anarchy leading to despotic rule and the end of liberty, attempted to devise a constitutional framework that would preserve the American experiment in self-government by providing “republican remedies to the diseases of republican government” in the parlance of the day. This constitutional order was to provide a form of government that was neither too strong nor too weak that would, among other things, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, and “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

The history of the 20th century is strewn with the corpses of failed experiments in popular government. The list includes: Russia 1917, Italy 1922, Germany 1933, Spain 1936, Greece 1936, Czechoslovakia 1948, Greece 1967, Argentina 1976, to name a few. These regimes did not ensure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare or secure the blessings of liberty, but instead, perished for a variety of reasons. It is significant that many of the failed liberal democracies of the 20th century had legal systems that guaranteed a whole array of constitutional rights, including an unrestrained free press, a right to dissent, student rights and defendant rights; most had active (albeit irresponsible) citizen participation in the political process and some had a vigorous pattern of litigation and a tolerant judicial system. In the cases of Weimar Germany and Republican Spain of the 1930s, these judicial and administrative systems were not only too tolerant, but essentially permissive, and even in some cases, sympathetic to political terrorists of the extreme right and extreme left. What many of the constitutional governments lacked was what they needed most: (1) an effective and orderly political process; (2) an ethos of prudence, compromise and restraint (3) a strong middle class and economic system; (4) sound civic (non-government) mediating institutions (5) an effective national security and diplomatic policy that guaranteed a collective defense against hostile powers; (6) an understanding of the nature of their enemies (e.g., Kerensky's failure to understand Lenin); (7) the will to take effective measures against disorder and subversion; and (8) a political culture that sustained the loyalty of both popular and elite opinion.

At the same time, the 20th century has also witnessed the creation of stable new constitutional governments in Germany, Japan, Spain, Portugal, Venezuela, Botswana, the Dominican Republic, and dozens of other nations since World War II. Furthermore, we are now seeing the hopeful beginnings of new experiments in representative government in Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America. The fate of these experiments is uncertain. Nonetheless, it is clear that interest in self-government and liberty is not restricted to Westerners and people of European descent, but includes Chinese, Tibetans, Vietnamese, Middle Easterners, South Africans, Central and South Americans—in a word, people everywhere. Therefore, an emphasis in international education on issues of political freedom, democracy, tyranny, and the difficulties of sustaining and strengthening popular government, is not an example of Western ethnocentrism or merely some updated Whig (hence, 19th century European) world view. On the contrary, these issues are of universal concern and crucial to an understanding of the world's future. Obviously, this does not mean that international education should neglect the complexities of world politics and the continuing competition (and often conflict) for power and preeminence among nations and transnational institutions.

Concurrently, the basic issues of good citizenship education must recognize the inherent tensions of our liberal democratic system between majority rule and

minority rights, liberty and order, justice and equality, and so on. The particular issues may be new and the demographic composition of our citizenry may have changed, but the general framework of principles and problems remains—how to establish justice; how to sustain and nurture a democratic ethos; how to maintain and improve our representative democracy and ensure a better life for all its citizens. In an immediate sense the issue posed at the beginning of the Federalist Papers is at the heart of the relationship between international education and education for American citizenship:

Whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force.¹⁷

The Founders, of course, answered with a qualified yes, so long as the “weaknesses and vices” that have plagued popular regimes throughout history could be avoided. The task was to design a system of government in harmony with human nature that relied on checks and balances not on utopian schemes and aspirations. Certainly the complexities inherent in this problem are crucial to an understanding of democratic government in the 21st century and beyond, and hence, are crucial to the connection between civic and international education.

Notes

1. National Association of Secondary School Principals, *NASSP Bulletin*, January 1990, p. 1.
2. *Beyond Our Borders: States and International Education*, Washington: National Governors' Association, 1989, pp. 22-23.
3. See, John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*. 1916. New York: The Free Press, 1966; George S. Counts, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* New York: The John Day Co., 1932; William H. Kilpatrick, *Education for a Changing Civilization*, New York: MacMillan, 1937; Sidney Hook, “1984 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities,” Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984; Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961; David Cohen, “The American Common School: A Divided Vision,” in *Education and Urban Society* Vol. 16 No3, May 1984, pp. 253-261; Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade*, New York: Basic Books, 1983; and Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987. Also, see Shirley Engle and Anna Ochoa, *Education for Democratic Citizenship* New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
4. Sidney Hook, “1984 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities,” Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984, p.3.
5. Clinton Rossiter, (ed.), *The Federalist Papers*, New York: New American Library, 1961, p.432.

6. Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education*, p.42, pp.45-46.
7. Comments by Robert Pickus at a conference of the American Forum for Global Perspectives in Education in St. Paul, Minn., May 3-6, 1990.
8. For example a 1988 CBS-New York Times poll reported that a random sample of 70% of Americans believed that public school teachers should be "required to lead students in the pledge of allegiance at the start of each school day" (25% opposed this requirement and 5% had no opinion). Interestingly, in 1986 the social studies advisory committee of the Arlington, Virginia school system reported that local citizens were concerned that the schools were "focusing too much on American flaws" while slighting American virtues. For an overview of American attitudes on civic education and national values the periodical *Public Opinion* (1978-1989) is particularly helpful. See, also, Gallup polls 1935-present, the survey research of the Roper organization since the 1960s, and a new publication, *American Enterprise*.
9. Martin Diamond, "The American Heritage and the Quarrel among the Heirs," in *News: For Teachers of Political Science*, published by APSA, Winter, 1978, p. 9.
10. See Willmoore Kendall and George Carey, *Basic Symbols of the American Political Tradition*, Baton Rouge, LA: LSU Press, 1970; Robert Goldwin and William Schambra (eds.), *How Democratic is the Constitution?* Washington, D.C.: AEI, 1980; Martin Diamond, *The Revolution of Sober Expectations*, Washington, D.C.: AEI, 1974; Walter Berns, *In Defense of Liberal Democracy*, Chicago: Regnery, 1984; Michael Novak, *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982; Harry V. Jaffa, *The Condition of Freedom*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1975; George W. Carey, *The Federalist: Design for a Constitutional Republic*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
11. See Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., *What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know?* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1987; Lynne V. Cheney, *American Memory*, Washington, D.C.: NEH, 1987; *The Civics Report Card*, Washington, D.C.: NAEP prepared by E.T.S., April, 1990; *The U.S. History Report Card*, Washington, D.C.: NAEP prepared by E.T.S., April 1990; *The Geography Learning of High School Seniors*, Washington, D.C.: NAEP prepared by E.T.S., Feb., 1990.
12. *New York Times*, Dec. 20, 1989; *Washington Post*, Dec. 2, 1989.
13. *Washington Post*, Feb. 22. 1990.
14. *Social Studies II: United States History and Government*, Albany, NY: State Education Department of New York, 1987, p.2.
15. Paul Gagnon, *Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect*, Washington, D.C: American Federation of Teachers, 1986, pp. 92-107.
16. *Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles*, Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1987, p.9.
17. Clinton Rossiter (ed.), *The Federalist Papers*, New York: New American Library, 1961, p.33.

Implications of the "New Demographics" and the "Information Explosion" for International Education

Herbert London

Harold Hodgkinson, former director of the National Institute of Education, wrote that, "The American public school curriculum is quintessentially European in nature, from the language it teaches to the music sung by its choirs. Although it is more relevant to blacks than in the past, there is still much to work on, and when we come to the curriculum *as it is learned* by all Asians and all the South Americans and islanders, we are truly flying blind." (emphasis in the original).

Here in rather unvarnished form is the view that the school curriculum must be responsive to a new set of ambient conditions summarized most often as the "information explosion" and the "new demographics." Presumably computers, television sets and the number of ethnics in our schools have rendered pedagogical assumptions of the past anachronistic. What educators in thrall to changing conditions suggest is that new conditions call for a new curriculum, one based on interconnection, multi-culturalism and "relevant" materials.

Admittedly this nation cannot tolerate the splendid isolation of the past. Our schools will inevitably spend more class time than has hitherto been the case on world history. Yet the essential character of this nation is as western as ever. The philosophical precepts of the United States are based on tolerance for one's immigrant background and past and an expectation that the language, laws and mores of one's adopted home will be embraced. There is the need for a canon to ensure acculturation, a canon that includes the *Magna Carta*, the *Constitution*, *The Federalist Papers*, the works of Shakespeare, Franklin, Jefferson, et al. For if the

principles to which this nation adheres are to be accepted, the provenance of individual rights and dignity, a belief in justice and equality and a faith in the rule of law must be imbibed.

The inference drawn from this proposition is not the abandonment of one's home of origin or a rejection of one's past. This nation has welcomed and continues to welcome people from diverse backgrounds recognizing the natural instinct for filial piety. But there should also be the recognition that to be a citizen of this nation all people must accept some minimal identification with and loyalty to the United States. A principal theme in U.S. history has been hyphenated loyalty which permits a fondness for the Old World and a gradual blurring of ethnic, racial and cultural distinctions within one's new home. That hyphen which is unique to this nation speaks volumes about American tolerance and interdependence, but it also demands one's allegiance to the adopted homeland.

It is certainly accurate to say we are living with an information explosion. But it is decidedly not true to contend—as many educators do—that more information implies more knowledge. Since information tends to be conveyed most effectively in the twin technologies of computers and television sets, it is worth noting that the primary uses of both machines are entertainment and organizing information. In neither case is it clear that the new technology has produced greater knowledge than we had before or greater wisdom than was evident heretofore.

In fact I would contend that curriculum designers have an obligation to knowledge that transcends the sciolistic and transitory. It is simply insufficient to argue that black students, to use one illustration, will be responsive to an Afro-centered curriculum. It is conceptually wrong-headed and it is patronizing to blacks precisely because of their race. If one curriculum goal is to explore the assertion of liberty among minorities, John Stuart Mill, a white Western male, speaks far more eloquently to this question than Malcolm X or Franz Fanon. It hardly bodes well for the future to assign to students already disadvantaged only those works or ideas consonant with racial and ethnic loyalties. These latter works may be relevant in some superficial sense, but in the long term a monopolistic dose of these readings will handicap students as assuredly as a lack of familiarity with arithmetic.

It has been argued that seven out of every ten new jobs in the beginning of the next century will be filled by women and minorities. This demographic condition has led some educators to the conclusion that the "new demographics" requires curriculum revision. But I maintain that what students of any gender, racial group or ethnicity require are the knowledge and skills to be effective citizens in *this* polity. If relevance is the standard by which curriculum decisions

are made, then one will teach students only what they want to learn. This proposition, as I see it, ensures marginal education and disadvantaged students.

It is instructive that several black organizations argued a few years ago that the Scholastic Aptitude Test is discriminatory. Cited as evidence for this claim was a verbal analogies question in which the correct answer was the word "regatta." It was alleged by black leaders that since blacks are often disadvantaged and culturally insulated, they could not possibly know what a regatta is. Yet it was at about the same time this incident took place that a recent emigre from Cambodia, who had been in this country only three years, won the national spelling bee with the word "daiquiri." What makes this illustration poignant is that this Cambodian girl entered this country without any knowledge of English or American customs or any familiarity of our national drinks.

If the new demographics and the information explosion suggest anything at all for international education, it is the reassertion of basic national principles such as human dignity and the adherence to rigorous standards of achievement. After all, it is knowledge of what makes this polity unique that gives texture to the study of other states and organizations. The essence of international education is what students should know about other peoples regardless of those now enrolled in the schools, what appears on the Johnny Carson show or how a computer pulse crosses national boundaries.

Understanding other people starts with knowledge of the self. But a sensible curriculum goes beyond that to inquire about the fundamental questions that inhere in the humanities, the questions that unite us as a people: What are we? What are we doing here? Recognizing the inevitable derision of death, how can we leave our mark in this life? What is our relationship to others? How should we conduct ourselves? How do we wish to be governed?

There isn't any doubt that effective teaching-learning techniques vary. Students do not all learn in the same way. But it would be a gross mistake to confuse the technique of teaching and learning with curriculum modification. Curiously the curriculum that is most effective for minorities and others, for females and males, for the poor and the rich is a curriculum that informs students about this culture and others, that offers the best that is known and written, that provides students with knowledge of truly great works, the deposited wisdom of our civilization. To deny the veracity of this claim by assigning marginal works that pander to those attempting to politicize the curriculum is, in effect, to handicap the very students who so desperately need our best counsel and most effective educational decisions.

International Education: The Search for Subject

Gilbert T. Sewall

Public alarm over American global competitiveness is a hallmark of the 1990s, and with reason. The United States is increasingly involved with foreign polities, economies, and cultures. The rate of transcontinental interaction—of money, ideas, and people—continues to accelerate. The immobility and localism of preindustrial society is beyond the grasp of most people—even those who live in relatively undeveloped parts of the world. Public officials and private leaders throughout the world have absorbed innumerable realities of international interdependence, so basic that they include the future of scientific advancement, the preservation of the environment, the advancement of human rights, the stability of financial exchange, and the quality of communication and transportation.

Americans have reason to be concerned about the curriculum in areas that bear directly on global affairs. In spite of initiatives to favor “international studies,” repeated surveys document profound geographic illiteracy among young Americans, even more disturbing when we compare U.S. students’ geographic knowledge with that of students in many other countries. In most education systems, geography is considered a basic academic subject. In the United States only one in seven students takes a discrete high school geography course. Of course, students learn non-American geography in world history classes. But only about 44 percent of the nation’s high school graduates do take such courses.

The problem extends beyond social studies. In mathematics and science U.S. students rank last in comparison with students in other advanced industrial nations. In foreign languages, student skills and general achievement remain a national

embarrassment; the French, Spanish, and Latin courses that were once part of the standard secondary-level regimen have been the great curricular losers of the last twenty-five years. The number of high school students engaged in any kind of serious foreign language study is small, and figures on student participation are ambiguous. In esoteric but strategically important languages such as Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic, American students are virtually untutored.

Given these shortfalls, official interest in "international education" is not surprising. Much can be done to make American education more "global" in scope. But what international education consists of is not at all agreed upon: *international education* is an elastic term, meaning different things to those who do agree that global studies and a "multicultural approach" should be moved closer to the center of the elementary and high school curriculum. A governor, business executive, curricular planner, classroom teacher, and textbook editor gathered around a table to discuss the subject might share few common assumptions about what international education is or what it should emphasize. There are basic questions about this subject area on which concordance does not exist. International education: What is it? Is it to be historically and geographically based? Is it to affirm democratic values? Who will do the teaching? Who will produce good instructional materials?

However these questions are answered, young Americans must understand the political and economic universe that surrounds them. The rise and fall of the Chinese democratic movement, increasing Japanese and German economic power, ongoing turmoil in Latin America and South Africa, events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and the 1991 war with Iraq are bringing to an end the geopolitical arrangements of the recent past. How the United States plans to respond educationally to these global changes remains to be seen.

In 1989, the National Governors' Association Task Force on International Development issued a report called *America in Transition*, a forceful statement meant to bear directly on American competition in the world of the twenty-first century and the educational issues involved therein. "Billions of dollars move in seconds from Milan to Tokyo to New York. Goods move around the world in a single day. An individual product may contain parts manufactured in five different countries and assembled in a sixth," the report said, reiterating the nature of the world economy.

America in Transition also admonished: "The United States is not well-prepared for international trade. We know neither the languages, the cultures, nor the geographic characteristics of our competitors." The report endorsed increased business support for "international education." Continued American ignorance of

global issues and indifference to basic educational productivity, it suggested, would erode the nation's security and future prosperity.

Multinational production and global consumption undergird the reality of economic interdependence in the contemporary world. Where does a chocolate bar come from? "The obvious answer—the candy store—won't do," Ari L. Goldman wrote about international education in *The New York Times*. "The cocoa comes from Ghana, the peanuts from the Sudan, the corn syrup from Iowa, the coconuts from the Philippines, the sugar from Ecuador. The wrapper comes from Canadian pulp, the tin foil from Thailand, the truck that brought the candy bar to the store, from Japan," Goldman noted, considering the chocolate bar from a "global perspective."

A dominant strain of international education is a current incarnation of a fifty-year-old political concept. This concept evolved from post-World War II enthusiasms: for the reconstruction of human relations and political institutions, for national planning, for planetary consensus. Franklin D. Roosevelt's Four Freedoms—of speech, of worship, from want, and from fear—and the 1945 United Nations Charter which captured this liberal and durable democratic spirit, established an optimistic view of the future emphasizing human reason, interdependence, rights, and liberties.

This form of idealism has been a resilient force in American culture. In the 1940s and 1950s, an epoch of unprecedented American power and wealth, the United States was confident that the rest of the world, especially less developed countries, looked to it as a model.

Many educators past and present have believed that schools are the logical place to inculcate values that will eventually promote peace and justice. For about fifty years, a wide range of community and religious organizations have encouraged the infusion into school curricula of humanitarian beliefs idealizing peace and harmony. Instructional materials and textbooks have long championed global cooperation and cautioned against the perils of unbridled nationalism. "The notion of global citizenship, the unity of humankind, and the belief that all people are brothers and sisters, have emerged regularly throughout the past forty years," Andrew F. Smith has said.

But over time some of these ideas have lost their freshness. They have often turned into social studies nostrums without serious meaning. The report of the Study Commission on Global Education, *The United States Prepares for its Future* (1987), for example, avoided definition of what social studies should teach in order to advance a general concept of global studies and international education. The report reiterated decade-old slogans, calling for "basic concepts of social

studies, such as interdependence, conflict, context, and multiple perspective." About all one could gather from this report's vague prescriptive endorsements is that social studies should be a vehicle to promote "diversity," "interrelatedness," and "coping skills."

International education's partisan edges are sometimes jagged. Elements of the global studies movement of the 1970s and 1980s have sometimes cast controversial ideas into curricula. These courses of study bear little or no resemblance to the kind of basic academic education that the nation's governors and corporate leaders probably have in mind when they endorse improved international education outlines and course models for the public schools. In many of these new curricula, a reconstructive view of the global future and a skeptical treatment of the United States' role in the world are often textual or subtextual.

Political suppositions often impinge on subject matter. In 1986, for example, Carlos E. Cortes and Dan B. Fleming began an essay about instructional materials in *Social Education*, a publication of the National Council for Social Studies: "World peace is becoming increasingly fragile as pressures of population growth and an imbalanced distribution of resources, the greater sophistication and spread of military technology, and the presence of nationalism converge to make even the most remote corner of the earth a potential tinderbox for igniting nuclear conflagration." The remedy, they asserted, is instructional materials that eschew "nationalism" and "ethnocentrism." While Cortes and Fleming based their observations on dated sources and statements (e.g., a 1966 report declaring that "nationalistic bias is as persistent in today's schoolbooks as in those used a generation ago"), their point of view represents a prominent strain of thinking among advocates of global studies and international education.

The British philosopher Roger Scruton has examined ideological bias of some such curricula in *World Studies: Education or Indoctrination?*, a 1985 paper of the Institute for European Defence and Strategic Studies. According to Scruton, world studies courses often replace serious knowledge and formal scholarship in the classroom with vitriolic "consciousness raising" attacks on bourgeois liberalism and international capitalism. "World studies masquerades as a 'discipline' whose aim is to produce an open mind toward the differing cultures and varying conditions of humanity," Scruton writes. "In reality, however, its purpose is quite the opposite. It is designed to close the child's mind to everything but the narrow passions of the radical."

A recent inspection of instructional materials and skills lists in global and international education reveals inadequate conceptual and factual foundations for effective teaching and learning in social studies. One 1989 resource package developed by a southeastern state, for example, echoes Robert Hanvey's 1975

paradigm for global education, which first advocated a "global perspective." This new model curriculum defines *global perspective* as "an attitude—a value position—a recognition of commonalities as well as diversities." This state curriculum calls for *perspective consciousness*, which diminishes "conflicts of opinion," concluding that: "Dredging the deeper, underlying layers—the orienting beliefs, assumptions and explanations of time, space and causality, all largely unconscious and unquestioned—is more significant." The guide's introductory pages call for "*state of the planet*" awareness, that is, the environmental interdependence of humankind. They also advocate "*cross-cultural*" awareness, "developing new methods, building on empathy" and also the art of "*transpec-tion*," a word yet to enter standard dictionaries, the "capacity to imagine oneself in another role within the context of one's own culture."

Such vagueness does not augur a crisply constructed or teacher-legible social studies curriculum. Nor does it suggest any authentic interdisciplinary venture that incorporates geography, world history, economics, civics, and foreign language. In the 1990s, international education may suffer from three elements—utopianism, underestimation of the national record, and multicultural separatism—all impeding reasoned understanding of the world.

Utopianism

One current in global studies and international education is possessed of cosmic ambitions. In the 1970s, when global studies was the *dernier cri* among social studies curriculum theorists, many educators agonized over the environmental future. They still do. A 1968 oil spill off the California coast, and books such as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* captured wide public attention. A Malthusian nightmare, forecast by reports and leading economists during the 1973-74 recession and oil shortage, portended the end of industrial civilization and mass starvation. Authoritative studies announced the advent of global want and environmental catastrophe. For some educators, the perceived horrors of the future made mere policy analysis irrelevant. The concerns of the moment induced a utopian cast of mind, the first priority of which was to introduce a cooperative, transnational, alternative vision of the planetary future.

In the 1979 book, for example, *Schooling For A Global Age*, edited by James M. Becker and part of a major education study conducted by John Goodlad, professors Lee and Charlotte Anderson of Northwestern University articulated a philosophy of education for world citizenship and outlined a scenario for "world-centered schools." According to the Andersons, the ideal school would act "to develop within students the competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of a global society."

While the Andersons made much of students as inhabitants of planet Earth, they made no mention of the polity or constitutional framework under which students actually lived, or of the sources of their affluence, leisure, and tranquil demeanor. A new age had evolved through universal thinking consonant with the Andersons' hopes, one that somehow ended the troubling realities of contentious nation-states and material scarcity.

In the Andersons' imagined Terra School of the future, a "learning manager"—teachers have evidently been relegated to an oppressive and authoritarian past—explains that the curriculum tries to show "how we humans depend on the planet's natural resources for gratifying all our needs. These include psychological needs such as our need for affection, beauty, self-actualization, and learning, as well as biological needs for food, water, air, and protection." In the lessons outlined for this idealized elementary school, nine-year-olds are working on a project. They are sending a set of thank-you cards to the rain forests in Brazil, expressing appreciation for the oxygen the forests have contributed to the air. Pretentiousness aside, this is all very nice. But one does not imagine a fast-track Japanese student, or for that matter, any Brazilian child doing the same thing in school. Conceptually, these lessons seem spongy and self-indulgent, a Mr. Softee of curricula, objectionable not because they are wrong but because they are facile and easy. Arduous lessons in etymology or Spanish grammar, in the river and mountain systems of Asia, or the development of English constitutional liberties are avoided, even as teacher and student may be led to believe that they are delving into subject matter more profound than that which ordinary geography and history lessons can provide.

Underestimation of the National Record

A second current in international education remains neutral or hostile toward democratic capitalism. It is highly critical of the American and European past and reflexively anti-militaristic. Such curricula urge "sensitivity" to how U.S. culture is viewed by other nationalities, especially the nation's adversaries. While peace and global harmony enter the conceptual picture, the theme usually takes a pessimistic view of American institutions in history and current affairs. In teaching about foreign policy, the U.S. failure in Vietnam and the need to avoid nuclear incineration are two basic curricular motifs.

Global disharmony, according to this approach, derives mainly from U.S. nationalism, expansionism, and imperialism. But this view ignores American exportations of human rights, improvements in public health and material prosperity to many non-Western nations. It seems blind toward the pleasures of life in affluent societies, where even the relatively poor own automobiles, refrigerators, and television sets. It ignores the animus felt in the Third World

toward the U.S. that derives simply from envy and resentment. It forgets that the liberties and individual opportunities that democratic capitalism nourishes account for the continuing influx of foreign capital and press of millions of would-be immigrants into the United States, not to mention popular democratic fronts from Beijing to Vilnius.

Lessons that go far to stress America's misdemeanors fail to acknowledge that in much of the world, the idea of human rights remains just an idea. In many non-democratic regimes, speaking unpopular or imprudent thoughts can lead to being tortured or having a price put on one's head. In the early 1989 Panamanian election, many Americans witnessed the spectacle of the opposition's vice-presidential candidate being savagely beaten, as one of General Noriega's thuggish soldier-policemen stood idly by. Are such events to be viewed by American children as colorful quirks of local custom? Or taking democratic privileges for granted, will young people just not care?

Civic indifference toward democratic values repudiates the condition on which government derives from the people. If citizen-based governance is no better, nor more successful, than non-democratic regimes, no reasonable basis exists to defend liberty and individual opportunity. Any moral equivalence reflects an exhausted, defeatist strain in democracy, inert to and ungrateful for public protections and liberties sought by citizens in other parts of the world, including privacy and due process.

Multicultural Education

A third current in international education, often called multicultural, is popular among ethnic advocates in urban school districts. This view asserts that people of color have been and are grossly misrepresented or under-represented in the social studies curriculum. These imbalances and omissions are taken sometimes to be intentionally racist. In 1989, a New York state task force report called "A Curriculum of Inclusion" made this charge, claiming that the state's social studies program nurtured "white nationalism" by emphasizing European-American culture. Accordingly, African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian students were "victims of an intellectual and educational oppression" that had "a terribly damaging effect on the psyche." Such lurid, irresponsible charges, rejecting the traditional idea of American commonwealth, threatened to damage the social studies curriculum for children of all backgrounds. Still, multiculturalism's appeal to many educators makes clear that sincere attempts during the 1970s and 1980s to revise curricula to treat racial and non-Western issues with greater care, sensitivity and balance, have failed.

From Western mores and ideas derive North Atlantic culture and, by extension, American institutions. Some multicultural advocates insist on a revised view of history focused on savageries perpetrated by European invaders and conquerors, a kind of revisionism that highlights and romanticizes non-Western cultures, as it stresses Western crimes of colonialism, racism, rapacity, and cruelty.

At its most pronounced, such an outlook is not the old corrective outrage of the American reform tradition that has denounced Tories, Simon Legrees and Robber Barons—but a crusade against a nation's evil that extends into the present. "Congenital, inherent, intrinsic, collective, something possibly inexpiable, and probably eradicable," the historian C. Vann Woodward wrote in *The Future of the Past* (1989), describing this emergent attitude. Such revisionism, he concluded, was a "transposition of symbols and the inversion of myths," a process that substituted national self-loathing for an earlier myth of "Adamic innocence."

Some curriculum planners advocate multicultural subject matter for another reason. They assert that, first of all, the social studies content must enhance the self-image of minority students. The historical record is of secondary interest. The curriculum is supposed to perform therapeutic services and build student self-esteem. Sometimes truth is discarded in the process. "For well over 5,000 years Africa and its culture served as the beacon of human civilization, intelligence and wisdom for the world," reads the frontispiece of a 1990 report called *African American Educational Excellence*. Some multicultural materials promote ethnic separatism and cultural divisiveness. Generally rejected is the idea of a cooperative public household, greater than its legion members, held together by citizens of different backgrounds who share a common national purpose.

It is likely that in advancing international education, the nation's leaders, the majority of parents, and teachers themselves envision a far different set of axioms, lessons, and interpretations than those outlined above. For them, international education might dedicate itself to basic subjects that give all students of all backgrounds a better idea of their place in the world—and the skills they need to operate successfully within it. Properly constructed, international education would hinge on an authentic interdisciplinary approach building on geography, world history, economics, civics, and languages.

In setting grandiose objectives, international education runs the risk of delivering next to nothing. Effective teaching and learning of world history and foreign cultures requires a larger block of time in students' course of study. Social studies teachers are already beleaguered by demands for coverage. Other curricula—reading, writing, mathematics, science, and more—compete for limited time in the day and year. Where will the necessary periods come from and what courses will they replace? Who will teach a complicated interdisciplinary

curriculum with any subtlety? Social studies teachers below the high school level rarely have formal training in history, government, or area studies. They are dependent on texts, guides, and resource materials that, to date, are not adequate.

Debates over the nature of international education remain part of a broader controversy inside the social studies and across the curriculum. Americans cannot seem to decide whether curricula should emphasize dissent and government error or celebrate national power and achievement, whether coursework should center on Western civilization or stress other cultures, and whether lessons should be historical or non-historical in design. Resolution of such differences goes far beyond the scope of international education.

In acting to increase student familiarity with the rest of the world, and promote productive international education, educators and other citizens might consider the following precepts:

(1) International education should start with the development of textbooks that explain in vivid ways why the world and its many cultures are so important to all American students.

Textbooks today comprise something very close to a national curriculum. What is included and excluded in such books does much to determine what is taught in classrooms across the country. As is well documented, student *ennui* in social studies derives partly from textbooks that fail to convey the drama and epic story of the global past. Before international education can move beyond wishful thinking, texts in social studies and other courses need to provide lessons that are genuinely interdisciplinary and intellectually stimulating. Such books need to take a global and multicultural view, an approach that transcends the cult of ethnicity. The past need not be "Eurocentric": In the study of the Fertile Crescent and Nile Valley, the advancement of the Buddhist and Moslem faiths, the activities of Chinese warlords and nineteenth-century Japanese industrialists, opportunities for engaging non-Western historical narrative abound. The incorporation of such vivid topics into the conventional fare of world history textbooks has begun—but profound literary deficiencies in social studies textbooks remain.

(2) International education should be alert to the place of English and foreign languages in the world community and, for all students, encourage fluency in at least one tongue.

English is the *lingua franca* of our era, the first or second language of virtually all the world's educated people. It will remain the global language for the foreseeable future. Its international prominence actually impedes the restoration of foreign language courses to the high school and college curriculum. Americans

need nonetheless to communicate in the native tongues of those whose affairs intermingle with ours. Collaterally, protecting public discourse begins with common domestic literacy. The ethnic cooperation and fluent communication that build from a universal language cannot be overestimated. All American children require a strong foundation in the English language.

(3) History and geography should provide the organizing principle of international education.

Social studies curricula should strengthen the fundamental scaffolding of history and geography, the basic academic subjects on which international education can build. It is geography that explains where we are, and where others are, on Spaceship Earth. It is history that explains how the present came to be. As the historian Paul Gagnon has said: "American history and ideas, and the vision and fate of democracy on earth, are not intelligible without a prior grasp of the life and ideas of Greece and Rome, Judaism and Christianity, Islam and Christendom in the Middle Ages, feudalism, the Renaissance and Reformation, absolutism, the English Revolution, the French Revolution, and the comparative experiences of Europe and the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."

(4) International education should highlight the evolution of Western political and cultural institutions since 1500 in order to explain the world that all humans now live in.

Lessons should include the emergence of ideas that underlie citizen-based governance, market economics, political toleration, and cultural pluralism. Such political values demand frank comparison with regimes that operate under different standards, including totalitarian rule and assorted forms of zealotry. International education should not minimize the violent conflicts of human history, still with us, including the desire for unlimited power, religious purity, and racial domination. In presenting remedies for global conflict, coursework should not shrink from candid descriptions and evaluations of such modern aggressors as Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Idi Amin, Pol Pot, Ayatollah Khomeini, Saddam Hussein—and the political systems that allow them to gain power. Political comparisons should not fail to affirm the advantages of democratic capitalism, the human desire for freedom and peace, and the blemished record of authoritarian rule in history. They should make the point that the U.S. Constitution is not designed to bear the weight of resolving all moral and philosophical questions—nor does it (as the amendment process indicates) assume itself to be constitutionally perfect. Students should not just be taught to feel a correct mixture of disgust and anguish toward slavery, concluding that American political institutions necessarily embody elements of evil. "The Constitution did not

persuade slave holders of the wrong they were committing, but the government it established ended the evil and removed the constitutional protections of slavery," Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr. has noted wisely. "In government by consent, it is morally required, as well as prudent, to do one's best to gain the consent of fellow citizens even when they are prejudiced or self-contradictory."

(5) International education should avoid subject bias that by design or accident frightens children.

To students and reflective people of all nations and ages, it should be clear that nuclear conflict and ecological overload present the two macro-issues of the millennium. The response by social studies educators should not be apocalyptic. These complex issues are probably best treated by broad student understanding of science and economics, not in classes where traditional social studies are replaced or excluded.

International education does students no service when it is grounded in fear and alarmism. Nuclear weapons are hard for thirteen-year-olds to understand. In many textbooks and lessons complicated subjects are simplified to the point of misrepresentation. One leading sixth-grade social studies text describes acid rain by saying: "Imagine how houseplants would react if they were sprinkled with vinegar!" As many peace and environmental curricula now stand, the evident subtext is: *If the bombs don't get you, the ozone layer and poisoned water will.* Such a statement does not mean to make light of these grave concerns. Nonetheless, such a gloomy view is deterministic and overly bleak. It provides a despairing view of the future. Its unintended message to children may be nihilistic, provoking an unhealthy but natural response on their part to the hopeless condition into which they were born.

No responsible educator wants to send such a signal, just as no responsible educator—however committed to international thinking—should believe that for humankind a magic, effortless, harmonious global future is probable, hastened by facile international education courses.

International Studies in the School Curriculum

Diane Ravitch

In the waning years of the twentieth century American educators have begun to realize that their students must be informed about the world. Technological changes and economic developments daily remind us that we live in an interdependent world. While sporadic efforts have been made to improve international studies in American schools, the most significant breakthrough has occurred in the state of California.

Studies of other nations and cultures play an important part in the history-social studies framework adopted by the California State Board of Education in 1987. I know of no other state that devotes as much curricular time to thoughtful, concentrated study of the historical experiences of other peoples. The California curriculum, of which I was a principal writer, presents a compelling model that deserves broad attention.

Because of its unique geographic situation, poised on the edge of the Pacific Rim, the state of California is daily conscious of the need to teach its students about the different countries that are our allies, our trading partners, and our competitors in the world. The state's economy—with its rich mix of agricultural products, high technology, and service industries—is increasingly involved in trade with foreign countries. California has an extraordinarily diverse population; among the public school enrollment, there is no majority, only minorities. In addition, the rapid growth in the state's population of immigrants from Asia and Latin America has reinforced the necessity of teaching the essentials of American citizenship to newcomers. In its enthusiasm for international studies, California has not lost sight

of its responsibility for preparing young people to be active and informed citizens of the United States.

Today, about half of all American high school graduates have never studied world history. Among the other half, most have studied only a single year or less of world history in high school. A generation ago, world history meant the history of Western Europe. Today it is a one-year course that attempts to cover all major world cultures, called "global studies."

The California curriculum rejects all of the current models of international studies as inadequate. State Superintendent Bill Honig assembled a framework committee of twenty educators to revise the state's history-social science curriculum. This committee determined that all children in the state of California should study three years of world history, one year of state history, and three years of American history. In addition, the committee supported the enrichment of historical and geographic studies in the early elementary grades.

Those who would improve their teaching of international studies must be cognizant of five major issues. Each of them represents an important commitment, a decision that must be made from the outset. I will review these and discuss how California faced each of these issues.

The first question is how much time will be allotted to international studies. There are only so many hours in the day, only so many courses that children can take in the thirteen-year span from K-12. Nothing can be accomplished by declaring lofty goals and then failing to allocate sufficient time for good teaching and learning. Any time redistributed to international studies must be taken from something else that was previously thought important. *States which intend to strengthen the position of international studies should promptly review the entire K-12 program in history-social studies to be sure that instructional time is adequate.*

The second question is how to staff new courses in international studies with qualified teachers. This is a matter of the greatest importance, because the best-laid plans will fail unless well-educated teachers are available. Few teachers today have the education and training to teach world history. Whether in history, mathematics or science, teachers who do not know the subject matter are ill-equipped to teach it. Universities should be encouraged to teach the kind of courses that future teachers of world history need, courses that help teachers to synthesize diverse bodies of knowledge about major civilizations in the world. *States which intend to strengthen international studies should immediately require future teachers to present either a major or minor in history, including the historical study of the United States and of at least two other nations or regions.* In

addition, states will have to assist current teachers to increase their knowledge of other civilizations by offering workshops, seminars, or time for continuing education.

The third question is that of *form*: Should international studies be presented as a series of regional studies, as in New York, or as integrated world history courses, as in California? In the regional studies model, each civilization is studied separately; in New York, seven world civilizations are studied in a two-year sequence. In the integrated world history course, the major civilizations of the world are studied during the same period in history, and a conscious effort is made to show how they interacted or to compare simultaneous developments. Either approach is instructionally valid. It is also valid to spend an entire semester or year studying one major nation or civilization. Even in the early grades, children will benefit by the intensive study of the art, literature, games, geography, dress, and customs of a major culture like China or ancient Egypt or ancient Greece or medieval Europe. It may be that they will learn more and remember more from this kind of concentrated, deep, and intimate immersion in the life of another culture for a full year than they will be traipsing speedily through eight or twenty or forty nations in the same year. *States which intend to strengthen the position of international studies should decide how to organize a vast amount of material in ways that children can understand and remember.*

The fourth question is that of *content*. Should international studies be presented through a historical perspective or through contemporary cultural studies? Another way to put the question is, should international studies be presented as world history or global studies? In world history courses, students examine the historical events and ideas that have shaped today's issues; in global studies, history takes a back seat to the political, sociological, economic, and anthropological dimensions of contemporary cultures. *States which intend to strengthen international studies should think seriously about their choice between history and studies of contemporary cultures.*

The fifth question is that of the *values* embedded in the international studies curriculum. What point of view should students bring to the study of other nations? Global studies courses have frequently been criticized for encouraging moral and political relativism, that is, for encouraging students to accept uncritically the political, social, and economic systems and behaviors in other countries. The issue is joined in this way: on one side are educators who feel that students should learn to appreciate other cultures and accept their ways of living, in a spirit of toleration and understanding; on the other are educators who believe that students should judge other cultures and countries by the same critical standards and democratic values that they are taught to apply in studying the United States. The first group accuses the second of being ethnocentric by

expecting other nations to reflect our democratic practices and values; the second group chastises the first for belittling or ignoring other peoples' yearning for human rights, democratic protections, and political freedoms. These polar differences should be brought out into the open and freely discussed. I confess that I am not neutral on this subject: I believe strongly that American children should learn the importance of democratic institutions in protecting basic human rights; I believe that those who are so taught will not be relativistic when judging the crimes of Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot, or other tyrannous regimes, or when judging our own history. *States which intend to strengthen international studies should decide whether they want their students to be taught to view other nations from the perspective of democratic values or whether they want them to be taught to accept the values of other cultures and political systems, regardless of how antithetical they may be to our notions of justice, equality and freedom.*

These issues were debated in California by the framework committee. These are questions on which reasonable people differ, and they should be discussed openly and frankly. The careful and prolonged consideration that the framework committee gave to these issues produced an interesting consensus. This consensus became the basis for California's decision to allocate three years of the K-12 curriculum to international studies. The following concepts form the rationale for the entire history-social science curriculum:

First, the framework committee agreed that the history-social science curriculum must be centered around the study of *history and geography*, the critical dimensions of time and place, because these are the two great integrative disciplines of the social studies. To try to teach current events or to teach global concepts without first establishing a historic and geographic context, the committee concluded, would confuse students and fail to give them a firm foundation for understanding future problems.

Second, it was agreed that a great defect of current practice in social studies is its superficiality; too much material is covered in too little time. Teachers on the committee complained that there was no time to read biographies, no time for debates, no time for research projects, no time for community participation; the relentless pressure for coverage meant that important events and people and ideas get a quick mention and nothing more. Unless students have the time to study events *in depth*, with some measure of intensity, then they will continue to forget most of what they have supposedly learned.

Third, it was agreed that social studies in the early grades (K-3) is largely a waste of time, because of the barrenness of the content. By emphasizing sociology and economics to little children, the social studies conveyed to them is dull, trivial, and superficial.

Fourth, it was agreed that religion is an important part of any people's world-view, and that religious ideas should be taught wherever appropriate in every history course.

Fifth, it was agreed that students' lack of interest and motivation is a major problem in the social studies, and much of the blame for this was attributed to the boring expository style of the compendious textbooks that dominate instruction. Therefore, the committee called on teachers to incorporate good literature, both fiction and non-fiction, and original source documents in their teaching of history. It also called on textbook publishers to remember, when they revised their textbooks, that history is "a story well told" and that they should strive to make their accounts accurate, dramatic, and exciting.

Sixth, it was agreed that the world history sequence would be organized chronologically over a three-year period. Chronology is the basic organizing principle of historical studies. Without chronology, history becomes a meaningless jumble of ideas, people, events, and trends. Without chronology, it is impossible to tell the difference between causes and effects. Without chronology, it is impossible to see how change occurs over time. Since the most important historical lesson is the understanding of change, the committee concluded that a chronological study of history would enable youngsters to see how events occurred, and with what consequences. Such understanding is essential in order to develop critical thinking skills and higher order thinking skills.

Seventh, it was agreed that our students must learn about the realities of global interdependence, and they must also learn the roots of American political ideas and institutions in Western Europe. While we want our students to be deeply concerned about the plight of all humankind, wherever they may live, public education has a specific responsibility to prepare future citizens for our democratic society. The committee saw these as different, but not mutually exclusive goals.

Eighth, it was agreed that the development of democratic and civic values among our students was of primary importance in preparing future citizens. One way they are taught is through behavior, like good sportsmanship, fair play, sharing, and taking turns. Another way democratic values are taught is through careful analysis and understanding of the relations between citizens and the state. As the framework says, "Whether studying United States history or world history, students should be aware of the presence or absence of the rights of the individual, the rights of minorities, the right of the citizen to participate in government, the right to speak or publish freely without governmental coercion, the right to freedom of religion, the right to trial by jury, the right to form trade unions, and other basic democratic rights." The California framework makes it clear that moral and political relativism is unacceptable in the teaching of world history. Students

are expected to respect the dignity of the individual, regardless of culture or country, and to inquire whether governments protect the basic rights of their citizens. Anything less would not only be a betrayal of American civic values, but would confer legitimacy on the undemocratic practices of dictators and tyrants.

With these concepts as a starting point, it became clear that a single year of world history or global studies was insufficient, because the history of the world cannot be taught in a single year in any form that students will be able to understand or care to remember. Furthermore, once the committee determined what should be taught, and which civilizations should be included, even two years was not enough time to teach world history in any reasonably valid way. The committee settled on three years of world history, and these three years are jam-packed with important, exciting material about the world's major civilizations.

Having reached this point, the committee had to decide whether to examine one civilization or world region at a time, from its earliest past to the present; or to divide world history into three periods, examining different civilizations at the same time. New York State followed the first practice; students in New York spend several weeks on Africa, then on Latin America, then on Western Europe, and so on. The framework committee in California rejected this approach, preferring to analyze the interactions and contrasts among different civilizations at the same time. Actually, both methods are valid, and there are good arguments to be made for either.

This is how the California approach to world history works. Students in sixth grade study ancient civilizations. They begin with a unit on prehistoric people and the development of the earliest societies. The next unit focuses on the beginnings of civilization in the Near East and Africa, with special attention to the peoples of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the African kingdom of Cush. A third unit is devoted to the ancient Hebrews and Greeks and to their contributions to Western ethical and democratic ideas. The conquests and travels of Alexander the Great provide the linkage to a study of the great civilization of ancient India. Following the spread of Buddhism from India to China, students are introduced to the study of ancient China. They learn about the teachings of Confucius, how he tried to make sense of a troubled world, and the ethical ideals of Confucianism. The land and sea routes of the China trade provide a bridge for the students to return to ancient Rome, where they learn about the Roman Empire, everyday life, social conflict, slavery, and the rule of law. They then learn about the rise and spread of Christianity and the challenge that it posed to the Roman Empire. The fall of the Roman Empire brings the course to a close.

This material, covering great civilizations around the world, is not presented as a plodding series of facts, one following inexorably after another. Students are

taught to use their powers of critical thinking in order to understand how geography affected the siting of different settlements; why certain societies rose to dominance at different times; and why great civilizations declined and fell. They examine the beliefs and values of these civilizations, their technology and their social organization, their art and their literature. Mapping activities help them understand the movement of people, ideas, and trade. If they can glimpse the drama inherent in the rise and fall of great civilizations, they will begin to understand the meaning of continuity and change and they will have greater comprehension of the nations that are contemporary descendants of these civilizations, which continue to be shaped by the legacy of their history.

The seventh grade world history course spans the globe during the middle ages or medieval era, from the fall of Rome through the growth of Islam, the ascendancy of African trading states, the rise of great civilizations of the Mayans, the Aztecs, and the Incas, the evolution of Chinese culture and society from the Tang Dynasty to the Ming Dynasty, and the development of Japanese society. When students look at life in Europe during the same period, they compare feudalism in Europe and Japan, one with its knights, the other with its samurai. A unit on Europe provides ample time to find out why the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Scientific Revolution were important and how they influenced ideas, art, commerce, and politics. The course ends with an investigation of the age of exploration and Enlightenment in Europe, which provides necessary background for the eighth grade course in American history.

The tenth grade course focuses on modern world history. It begins with a discussion of the rise of democratic ideas and the great democratic revolutions in England, the United States, France, and Latin America. From this vantage point, students are able to learn about and analyze such complicated phenomena as the industrial revolution, imperialism, World War I, the totalitarian regimes of Stalin and Hitler, World War II, and the problems of nationalism in the world today.

This brief content review should demonstrate why the framework committee decided that three years is necessary for the study of world history. And yet it scarcely seems enough time to teach the most important milestones in the history of the world's major civilizations.

Some global educators scorn the teaching of history or merge it with half-a-dozen other social studies. They fail to see the contemporary relevance of history or they fear that too much attention to the past will impair their ability to deal with current events. But the framework committee concluded that this was a mistake. To teach global studies without organizing it historically is a serious error. It is simply not possible to understand some of the world's most difficult, most intractable problems without knowing their history.

It is true that environmental issues span national boundaries. It matters not who you are or what your history is if you are a victim of acid rain, fouled waters, air-borne radiation, or other forms of pollution. But people do not frame solutions to multi-national problems as individuals; governments do. And governments are chosen and defined as a result of decisions made in the past, and we can learn about these decisions and arrangements only by studying history. If we ignore the history that determines the politics and ideology of today's governments, we will be farther than ever from solving or even understanding the problems that concern us all.

Current events, at any time, are shaped by history, and are incomprehensible without historical context. During the last years of the 1980s, Gorbachev was trying to distance himself from the legacy of Stalinism. But does this make sense unless you know what Stalinism means, who Stalin was and what he did? Can anyone, young or old, understand the meaning of *glasnost* and *perestroika* without being knowledgeable about the history of the Soviet Union and the failure of totalitarianism? Can anyone understand the effort to redirect Russia's political and economic policies without knowing the history of Communism?

How can anyone make sense of the political, economic, and social upheavals in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union without knowing the history of the region? How can anyone interpret the historic events in the Baltic states unless he or she knows how the Baltic states were absorbed by the Soviet Union? What was the Stalin-Hitler pact? What happened in Katyn forest and why are Poles so agitated about it? What was the Yalta Pact? Of what value is it to teach children about the beauties of Polish or Hungarian culture without also teaching them how these states came in the Soviet orbit and how those states regained their national independence?

The indispensable elements in the program of world history adopted by California are these: an emphasis on history as the basic subject around which to organize the content of the courses; and an emphasis on democratic values as a fundamental means of understanding the relations between citizens and the state.

As I noted at the outset, the greatest problem in the teaching of world history is the problem of finding time in the existing curriculum. The framework committee decided to introduce children to the diversity of cultures in the early years of elementary school, long before they take their first world history course. The new curriculum significantly changes the content of social studies in the early grades.

In the overwhelming majority of American schools, the social studies in grades K-3 are governed by a peculiar concept called "expanding environments."

According to this concept, which is found in the curriculum of almost every state and city, children are supposed to study "Me" in kindergarten, "My family" in first grade, "My neighborhood" in second grade, and "My community" in third grade. This preoccupation with the here and now precludes any effort to enrich children's social studies with knowledge of other times and places.

By following the narcissistic lockstep of "expanding environments," children study what they already know. They learn that children like birthday parties, that people live in families, that cities have streets, and that people drive cars and buses on streets. So empty of content are the textbooks for the early grades that they are a national embarrassment. Imagine spending three years teaching this trivial and superficial stuff to children who have viewed assassinations, election returns, and space launches on television, and who know from the nightly news about drugs, homelessness and war. No wonder that children regularly report that social studies is their least interesting, least important subject.

So, instead of boring children with the repetitive study of community helpers and the supermarket, teachers in California will introduce youngsters to stories, biographies, myths, and legends from many cultures, including our own. Children will examine their family history and trace the geographic route by which their ancestors came from all over the globe; they will learn about cultural differences and similarities through the riches of literature. The goal in the studies of these early grades is to begin with children where they are, and then to reach out across time and space to develop their background knowledge. They will learn about the way their own communities have changed over time and about significant men and women who have made a difference. By the time children get to their first study of world history in grade 6, they will already know a great deal about the beliefs, the heroes, and the lore of many other civilizations.

If we are serious about expanding the place of international studies in the curriculum, there is much work to be done:

- State governments must be concerned about the quality of teacher education; far too many states grant credentials to teachers who are not well prepared in their subject matter. The fault lies not with the teachers, but with the governors and legislatures which have promulgated laws and regulations requiring teachers to take an abundance of education courses while setting low expectations—or none at all—for their mastery of the subject they will teach.
- State legislators must be prepared to pay for staff development to enable today's teachers to learn the material that they will be expected to teach. Simply mandating courses in world history and geography will be of little value if teachers are not prepared to teach these subjects.

• Educators and parents must be concerned about the state curriculum and whether it sets appropriate expectations for the study of American history, world history, and historical content in the early grades.

• States must be ready to join California's lead in demanding a new generation of textbooks and other instructional materials. Study after study has told us that too many of today's textbooks are boring, superficial, and an obstacle to student learning. Students need well-written narratives, exciting accounts of true historical events, honest treatment of historical controversies, dramatic biographies of the men and women who changed history. They need better textbooks, and they need access to good books that tell the stories better than the textbooks do and to good technology that helps to frame the issues in graphic ways.

• Educators, parents and other citizens must insist that the world history curriculum share the same civic and democratic values as the American history curriculum. Just as we expect our American history curriculum to focus on the importance of human rights and political liberties, just as we expect it to teach children to respect freedom of opinion, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and the right to disagree with one's government, we should expect the world history curriculum to embody the same commitments.

Early in 1989, an incident involving the author Salman Rushdie and his novel *The Satanic Verses* underlined the dilemma of teaching world history. Most Americans were horrified when the head of a foreign state called for the murder of an author. But some commentators, including a former President of the United States, said that we should try to see the affair through the perspective of those who were offended by the novel. This is an approach that many educators take in teaching global education: Don't be judgmental; accept the other person's values; don't impose your views. The problem with this line of reasoning is that if they take their side, and we take their side, who will take our side? Who will champion the values of freedom of mind? Who will defend the values that we hold dear if we do not? And if we train our children not to be judgmental about assaults against freedom in the international sphere, can we expect them to defend freedom if it is assaulted in their own community?

When I expressed this viewpoint at a conference of international educators, the place fairly burst with challengers who disagreed with my position on teaching democratic values. They charged that I was ethnocentric, nationalistic, and chauvinistic. They thought that it was clear as could be that only people in the West cared about western-style democratic rights and freedoms. As best I could make out their position, they argued that only people who already lived in democratic nations cared about democracy; those who didn't weren't interested.

And wasn't it condescending and ethnocentric for us to impose our values (e.g., freedom and democracy) on them?

Amazingly and happily, that point of view became muted in the social studies after hundreds of thousands of Chinese students, workers, and intellectuals thronged to Tiananmen Square in Beijing in the Spring of 1989 to demand democracy and human rights. To be sure that no one missed their point, they constructed a "goddess of democracy," a cousin of our own Statue of Liberty and carried banners quoting Patrick Henry ("Give me liberty or give me death"). Perhaps the students didn't fully understand western-style democracy, but they seemed to want it. When the protests were finally crushed by the army, it was clear that the regime wanted the world to believe that the demonstrators were nothing more than a handful of counterrevolutionary thugs, espousing western bourgeois liberal ideas. Under the circumstances, the global relativists sounded eerily like apologists for the Chinese government.

Time might have erased the memory of Tiananmen Square—tyrants always count on world opinion having a short memory—but then during the remaining months in 1989, Communism suddenly collapsed in Eastern Europe. The Communist party lost control of Poland and Hungary; then the Communist dictatorships crumbled in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia demanded independence from the Soviet Union. In a matter of months, the political-economic face of central and eastern Europe changed. It has become impossible for any but the most doctrinaire of ideologues to contend that western-style democracy belongs only in the West. Despite forty years of indoctrination, the people of Eastern Europe wanted a multi-party democracy with a free press, a limited government, and the rule of law. Finally, by the end of 1991, the Soviet Union itself had ceased to exist. Those who have insisted that democratic values and institutions are not universal have fallen silent, at least for the time being.

As we move to introduce a larger program of international studies into our schools, let us do so with the understanding that we have much to gain by learning about other cultures and that they have much to gain by learning about ours. Learning about other people does not require us to relinquish our values. Nor does it require us to teach our children to practice a double standard about how governments should treat their citizens. At the very least, we should recognize the universality of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And as we expand our offerings about other cultures and civilizations, let us be sure that we provide well-educated and properly trained teachers, good instructional materials, and a well-planned curriculum for our children.

Geography's Role in International Education

Raymond English

Challenges and Pitfalls

Geography has been neglected in our schools. Intellectually challenging subjects were diluted in the 1960s and 1970s, but geography, like history, was often regarded as almost irrelevant. The reason, I suggest, is that the social studies became a mishmash of social therapies. When educators concentrate on social reform by changing the attitude and behavior of young people, the intellectual content of the curriculum is bound to suffer. Students and society lose on both fronts: behavior and attitudes remain by and large unchanged, but the unavailing efforts in this direction diminish time and energy available for skills and knowledge.

Another pedagogic assumption of recent decades may have contributed to the neglect of the core subjects, history and geography. That assumption is that "rote-learning" is obnoxious. Much of basic geography and history calls for memorization of patterns of events, sequences, chronology, the configuration of the Earth, the location and spatial relations of cultural and physical features on maps. Until these elements are part of one's mental make-up there is no foundation on which to build refinement and elaboration of knowledge.

It should be noted that learning to remember, and learning *how* to remember by perceiving relationships, significance, and associations, is the principal business of school children until they reach the age of twelve or thirteen. Dorothy Sayers, in an essay on education, divided the elementary and secondary school years into

three stages of mental development: the "Parrot" (memorizing and imitating), the "Pert" (assertive, rebellious, critical), and the "Poetic" (self-discovery, introspection, attempts to find one's role and purpose in life). If Ms. Sayers was right, the notion that rote-learning is *ipso facto* undesirable is untenable, and educators should use the precious "Parrot" years to provide their students with a battery of essential knowledge in all fields. Furthermore, habits of memory acquired when we are young will stay with us, whereas if we do not acquire them at an early age we shall find it difficult to learn them later. How can we learn foreign languages if we have been encouraged to despise "rote-learning"? How did we learn to speak our native tongue?

Another obstacle impeding sound geographic learning is the use of geography as a vehicle for propaganda. This is a persistent temptation, as it is also in the sister field of history. A few examples come to mind.

The Nazis used geography, especially maps, to inculcate Germany's need for "living space," and to engender envy of Britain's colonies. German youngsters were also taught that enemies were encircling and strangling their country: in other words, the aggressors in a future war were France, Britain, and the Soviet Union. In the schools of Argentina, maps and textbooks show the Falkland Islands (*Malvinas*) as Argentine possessions. On the other hand, the British geographer, Sir Halford Mackinder, complained ninety years ago that British school teachers suppressed geographic instruction because they considered it to be "imperialist propaganda."

Closer to home, our own National Council for the Social Studies issued a special edition of *Social Education* ostensibly on how to teach about South Africa, which incited irresponsible attacks on the status quo and provided no balanced information on the complex problems that beset the whole of Africa south of the Sahara. At no point in the whole issue was the striking economic success of South Africa mentioned, nor the fact that well over a million black workers from neighboring states flock to South Africa for work and higher standards of living. Much was said about the African National Congress, although not about its terrorist tactics and use of fiery "necklaces." The leader of the largest South African ethnic group, Chief Buthelezi of the Zulus, was totally ignored, although he represents a significant segment of the population.

Like the treatment of Africa, the discussion of economic development in the Third World tends to one-sidedness, emphasizing the transfer of wealth from developed countries, accepting the antiquated notion that socialist central planning is the only way to economic development, and ignoring the findings of researchers such as P.T. Bauer. Underlying most lessons about the Third World and economic development is Lenin's theory of imperialism as capitalist exploitation and theft,

which has encouraged guilt-assuaging policies of foreign aid to socialist politicians in the less developed countries. Such policies actually discourage development.

Concern with injustice toward the Third World has led some experts to suggest that world maps be redesigned so that the South Pole is "at the top" of the map. This, they claim, will show that the developed countries of the north are relatively small and inferior. Certainly map projections affect our perceptions of spatial relations, and students should learn something of these complications before graduating from high school. Varied projections should be studies, not with a view to influencing attitudes, but as part of the acquisition of important knowledge and insights.

So much by way of warning against the pedagogic temptation to indoctrinate naive captive audiences. There is a final obstacle to be faced. Just how technical and scholarly should be the geography learned in elementary and high school?

This question arises also when we focus on history. In these subjects, for most pre-college students, the emphasis should be on the information and understanding that an intelligent citizen needs, together with the equipment (reading ability, logical facility, and vocabulary and visual competence) to continue to learn. Academic experts are prone to try to turn students into small-scale models of historians and geographers, but this is almost certainly counter-productive, since it displaces the effort that should go into acquiring broad, sound, general knowledge of the subject. It may be interesting to spend weeks deciding where on an imaginary map a hypothetical city might be founded, but in the meantime the youngsters might have learned the locations, climate, and economic or political importance of a dozen real cities, and learned to visualize the map showing their locations.

Suggested Syllabus and Objectives

At this point we may turn from "don't's" to "do's." In warning against over-refined technicalities in geography I do not suggest that terms and technical skills of the geographer should be neglected, but rather that they should be selected with a view to non-expert use. A dozen examples of necessary concepts and skills come to mind.

First and foremost: understanding and using the globe (much easier than used to be the case, now that we have portraits of our planet from space); earth-sun relations; longitude and time-zones; latitude and climate variations; the seasons and the tilt of Earth's axis; the orbit-pattern of artificial satellites; great circle routes.

Second: reading a map, in such a way as to get all available information: relief, physical features, cultural features, scale, direction, use of the "legend." Using a magnetic compass and recognizing magnetic declination (or variation, or deviation).

Third: knowing about types of climate, and how to find out about climate; for example, by using climate-type maps, or by interpreting statistics or graphs of average monthly temperatures and precipitation.

Fourth: humans' use of and adaptation to their environments, historically and at the present time: an astounding story of variety and ingenuity, not without a seamy side—destruction of environments, population pressures, and genocide.

Fifth: circulation of air and water and even land (continental drift); circulation as a human activity—migration, war, exploration, trade, communication, transportation.

Sixth: political geography.

To list these generalized abstractions is easy; to give them concrete, practical application in thirteen years of schooling is more difficult. We may begin by suggesting that history and geography should be the core subjects in the period called social studies, and that the general analytical framework should be based on those two disciplines with contributions from the social sciences: economics, political science, anthropology, sociology, and psychology; and occasional light from the humanities: philosophy, religion, literature, music, and the plastic arts.

Exposure to the core subjects should be planned, so that a sequential, cumulative process of learning may be followed. Above all, *geography should be part of every historical study and of every study of regions, cultures, and international relations in the world today*. From an "international education" point of view, essential geographic knowledge is *political* and *economic*. This knowledge is best learned in conjunction with either history or contemporary "area studies."

The new California *History-Social Science Framework* sets an admirable example. Almost without exception, when history is mentioned in course descriptions, it is coupled with geography. Leaving aside the primary grades (K-3) let us glance at the remainder of the syllabus.

In grade 4 the topic is the state history of California, which involves constant use of geographic information.

Grade 5 is entitled *United States: History and Geography: Making a New Nation*. Grade 6 is *World History and Geography: Ancient Civilization*; grade 7: *World History and Geography: Medieval and Early Modern times*.

With grade 8 comes another look at America: *United States History and Geography: Growth and Conflict*. The earlier history is reviewed and the story brought down to 1914, with a brief concluding look ahead.

The senior high school curriculum includes one year (grade 9) of electives, of which two are geography pure and probably not too simple: *Physical Geography* and *World Regional Geography*. Other courses include *Area Studies: Cultures*; and *Anthropology*.

Grade 10 returns to the rigid core curriculum: *World History, Culture, and Geography: The Modern World*.

Grade 11 is *United States History and Geography: Continuity and Change in the Twentieth Century*.

Grade 12 has two required semester courses, one on *American Democracy*, with a section on comparative government and communism. The other course is *Economics*, including "Comparative Economic Systems" and "International Economic Concepts."

My reason for listing these proposed core subjects in California is, first, that I want to give three cheers and to congratulate the young people who will have the chance of using them; and, second, that they are excellent examples of the close integration of history and geography and the ancillary utilization of the social sciences. Much will depend on whether teachers and instructional materials ensure that geography—especially maps, maps, maps—is truly integrated in the history lessons.

My readers may feel that I am shirking my responsibilities in borrowing from the California curriculum. But after all, the best things in education *should* be copied.

Moreover, I can honestly claim that many of the ideas and much content in the California curriculum parallel loosely the plan that I developed in textbooks, teacher's guides and instructional materials over the period 1964-19'9. The series *Concepts and Inquiry*—distributed by Allyn and Bacon—covered kindergarten through grade 8. In addition, we produced a series of short books to be used in grade 12 in order to review the essentials of social science. This series, entitled *This is Where I come In*, was in experimental form at the time when I resigned

from the program in protest against the publisher's insistence on lowering the standards and quality of the instructional materials.

For comparison, brief descriptions of the substantive content of *Concepts and Inquiry*, grade by grade, are given below.

International awareness was introduced in kindergarten with pictures and stories of "Children in Other Lands"—Japan, Mexico, England, Nigeria. Grade One's theme was "Our Country," and simple stories of explorers, from Marco Polo to John Glenn and Jacques Cousteau.

In grade 2 the theme was "Communities" in America, with studies of Eskimos in Port Barrow and Aborigines of Central Australia. Grade 3 offered a simple, narrative story of American history and an analysis of "Metropolitan Communities." In these primary grades we sought to integrate simple history with geography and map and globe skills.

In grade 4 the same procedure of using history and geography as the basic material for analysis was followed in studies of "Agriculture" and "Industry." An optional area study of "The Indian Sub Continent" was also offered.

Grades 5 and 6 took up world history and geography: "Ancient Civilization," "Four World Views" (Confucian, Buddhist, Judaic, Greek), "Greek and Roman Civilization," and "Medieval Civilization" (Islam, Latin Christendom, the Mongol Conquests in Asia). Then followed "The Age of Western Expansion," "New World and Eurasian Cultures" (Maya and Aztec Civilizations, European colonies in the New World, Russia under Ivan IV, and Japan in the later Middle Ages), "The Challenge of Change" (Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries), "The Interaction of Cultures" (the world in the Nineteenth Century). Two area studies were offered: "The Middle East" and "Latin America."

Grade 7 dealt with contemporary controversial social challenges: Technology from the Scientific Revolution on; "Prejudice and Discrimination" (group psychology); "International Tensions" (recent history of international affairs); and "Economics," mainly micro and consumer economics. The area study dealt with Africa.

American history and geography was the theme of grade 8. These volumes were used at grade 8 in private schools, but in public schools, where reading achievement deteriorated in the 1970s, our books were usually used in grades 10 and 11.

This description does not do justice to the carefully designed sequence, planned repetition, and cumulative learning in the program. Nor does it indicate the intricate conceptual framework involving analytic tools not only from geography and history, but from economics, political science, socio-anthropology, and a combination of philosophy, psychology, religion, and literature and art. An essential element in the program was the meticulous teacher's guide that accompanied each pupil textbook.

I should like to emphasize the importance of the planned, sequential, cumulative approach. The social studies, in the past, often became so formless that no one could state what the students should learn or had learned. Distracting, well-intentioned but manipulative instruction was introduced haphazardly. Neither teachers nor students seemed to care about what the students were supposed to have learned in previous years.

Whereas a mathematics teacher would identify the state of knowledge of the class before teaching the next stage, social studies teachers were generally indifferent. They were less concerned with a body of knowledge than with attitudes: Are the students "democratic," "tolerant," "unprejudiced," "critically thoughtful," "clarified in their values," "peace-loving"? When you are a missionary and a psychological therapist, it is demeaning to raise questions such as: "Where is Nicaragua?" "How far is Cuba from Florida?" "Point to Iraq on the map;" "Describe a typical rain forest;" "What is tundra?" "Go to the map and point to the countries that make up the European Community;" "Why is free access to the Persian Gulf important to the United States?" "Which countries produce high tech goods?" "Where are the world's major exporters of grain located?"

No doubt I exaggerate somewhat, but few would disagree with my assertion that knowledge, or intellectual equipment, has been a secondary consideration in social studies. We must reverse the learning priorities. When knowledge is secondary to attitudes and motives, even the modicum of facts and knowledge in the curriculum is liable to be distorted and falsified. Witness the *Social Education* issue on South Africa that I mentioned. Or consider materials on peace education that imply that the Soviet Union under Brezhnev was a democracy, slightly different from ours, with an effective written constitution and lots of human rights.

May I make a further comment and plea? During the past 25 years textbooks in general, and especially in social studies and literature, have acquired a bad reputation. They have been condemned as dreary, irrelevant, boring, erroneous, and biased. All these accusations are valid. But the recommendation that textbooks be abandoned is mistaken and impractical.

For many if not most teachers in social science and the humanities, the textbook and teacher's guide are indispensable tools of instruction. If these are abolished, instruction in our schools will be far more disorganized and disoriented than it is already. The remedy is (a) to improve textbooks, and (b) to provide a variety of textbooks to cater to the tastes and needs of teachers and the aptitudes and abilities of students.

Let curriculum designers, textbook writers, and teachers bear in mind the question: Are we giving the students the information and skills they need to begin to understand the world they live in? Can students read and criticize editorials in the press or on television? Do they know how to find information on other nations (government, economics, per capita GNP, exports, imports, accessibility, and so on)? Can they read maps, whether Mercator projections of the world, street plans of their town, or specialized maps explaining a single concept?

I give examples of the questions a teacher of geography should ask. Clearly there are similar questions about general knowledge that can and should be asked in history, economics, and other social sciences.

Our focus for the next decade should be *Knowledge*. If we do that job well, other benefits will follow.

China: Case-Study of Textbook Failures

André Ryerson

A youngster studying his lesson on China in *Exploring World Cultures* (Ginn & Co.) will learn of the selfless dedication that inspires China's Communists, the society's new elite:

The life of a Communist Party member is not easy. Members are expected to carry out party decisions regardless of hardships or personal sacrifices. They are expected to be an example to the people by promoting hard work and thrift. Yet no shortage of candidates for party membership exists.

A teacher's guide published by China Connections (Community Learning Connections, Boston) concludes that

the Chinese government is trying to: 1. improve education throughout the country; 2. build more industries in the countryside; 3. reduce economic inequality; 4. manage and reduce its population; 5. improve Chinese women's rights.

One of the tasks that students are assigned is, "Explain why the Chinese government has the trust of the Chinese people."

Note: The bulk of this article was originally printed in the *American Educator*, a journal of the American Federation of Teachers, Fall 1989, under the title, "China's Untold Story." We thank the *American Educator* for permission to reprint the article.

One might think the question would have occurred to either of the guide's two authors: Since China is not a democracy and is a country where free expression is not permitted, how do we *know* that the government "has the trust of the Chinese people"?

Questions like this—about democratic government, democratic values, and human rights—seem not to occur to most of those writing educational materials on China. Indeed in a review I have made, a majority of popular educational materials on China omit the reality of a totalitarian government suffocating its people. Instead, the picture of China that emerges is of a nation defying the odds in developing itself, feeding its people, housing them, providing education and building new factories, while allowing its citizens the pleasures of traditional family life. Rural work teams encourage sharing. Street and factory committees help individuals with their private problems. The textbooks display color photographs that show well-stocked food stores, women doing industrial work, and a countryside of lush agricultural landscapes. Here is a people that has rid itself of old and primitive traditions, a people and government committed to the ideals of equality, and while the government is structured somewhat differently from ours, the people seem to elect local officials, and the Communist Party works to improve the people's lot. It may be a more controlled society than ours, but the Chinese are not disturbed by this fact. A few of the campaigns of Mao Zedong did not work out so well, admittedly, despite their noble aims. But whatever the problems under Mao, the post-Mao regime has made adjustments, increasing private initiative, and the Chinese people—though less wealthy than we—are happily striving toward a better life.

American students taught with these materials must have been incredulous at the events in Tiananmen Square in the Spring of 1989. Why would Chinese students demonstrate against a government so dedicated to answering the people's needs? And how could such a government respond with a massacre?

The disturbing truth is that most American educational materials on China, with remarkable consistency, avoid those questions that pertain to issues of democratic government, democratic values, and human rights. Questions such as: How are people's basic rights and civil liberties protected? If they are not protected, to what extent are they violated? What institutions are available for people to express their will? How strong are these institutions? Through what modalities does the government or party seek to control people? How effective and total are these controls?

Whether such questions should inform students' study of nondemocratic countries has been an issue of some debate in the field of global/international education. Many global and international educators have argued that it is

inappropriately "ethnocentric" to look at other countries through our own democratic lens. They insist, "Not everyone wants to be like us." Many educators also view global/international education as an extension of multi-cultural education, as an opportunity to increase appreciation of diverse cultures and customs. This group is, understandably, eager to present foreign cultures in the best possible light, so as to thwart students' natural instincts toward prejudice. Indeed, many tests and guides in the international/global field include prefatory notes urging teachers to see such education as an antidote to students' tendencies to ethnocentrism and stereotyping.

A third strain noticeable in global/international materials is the belief that in our interdependent world, under the shadow of nuclear weapons, the future of world peace may depend on educating students to see the commonalities among different peoples, not the differences, for differences can lead to hostility, conflict, and war. This group of educators prefers a curriculum geared to topics such as families, languages, the arts, and other subjects that focus on peoples' common humanity. If they must deal with issues such as government and values, they tend to do so in a neutral voice, implying that just as all peoples have families, some being nuclear and others extended, so all peoples have governments, some being democratic and others not.

Outspoken critics of these various approaches have argued that when international education materials are not animated by a commitment to democratic principles and values, civic education is undermined. Students are left thinking that there are no universal human rights, that democratic values are merely optional values, a matter of personal taste, nothing about which to get overly concerned—even possibly—something to be compromised when the going gets tough.

These criticisms raise serious questions about the assumptions, methods, and civic values that presently shape international education. By looking at how a particular country's history and culture are taught, we can better judge the weight of these otherwise abstract arguments. By virtue of its distance, both geographic and cultural, China is a logical choice for a case study of how the doctrines of international/global education are being translated into actual teaching materials.

For this study, I reviewed those textbooks and teacher's guides on China that are among the most widely publicized or used. The twenty-seven reviewed items include thirteen textbooks (four of the most popular secondary world history texts, five of the most popular elementary texts, and three global studies texts) from major publishers with recent copyright dates (mostly 1986-89), plus fifteen teaching guides on China (or with substantial sections on China) from the six most

frequently recommended¹ distributors of supplementary educational materials on China, mainly university-based resource centers for international studies.

It should be noted that the complexity, scope, and level of these materials varies enormously. The textbooks, which aim at an overview of selected countries, devote anywhere from seven to seventy-three pages to China; obviously depth, detail, and concern for history will vary accordingly. Among the teaching guides, three are geared to early elementary students² and emphasize such topics as China's animals, its calligraphy, and its arts—although they also make small, possibly naive, but essentially dishonest dips into politics and values. Four guides, from the Stanford Project in International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), focus on specialized topics such as the family, education, and rural development in China.

One cannot expect the early elementary guides and the narrowly focused topic guides to give full attention to questions of government and values; but one can insist that they not mislead the reader by distorting facts or ignoring realities that properly fall within their scope. Nonhistorical materials can ignore details of history; but their contemporary accounts should reflect the history that has shaped the present, just as we expect any fair account of contemporary black life in America to make *some* reference to blacks' second-class status prior to the Civil Rights Movement.

On the issues of democracy and human rights posed earlier, of the twenty-seven materials under review, only six can be said to do a fair job within the limits of their genre. These books have faults, but they are honest efforts in pursuit of the truth: *Our Common Heritage: A World History* (Ginn & Co.) by Daniel Roselle; *Eastern Hemisphere*³ (Macmillan) by Barry Beyer, Jean Craven, Mary A. McFarland, and Walter C. Parker; *History and Life: The World and Its People* (Scott, Foresman & Co.) by T. Walter Wallbank, Arnold Schrier, Donna Maier, and Patricia Gutierrez-Smith; *The World Yesterday and Today*⁴ (Silver Burdett & Ginn) by Kenneth S. Cooper and Gary S. Elbow; *China* (Dushkin Group) by Suzanne Ogden; and *Values in Conflict: Literature on China's Youth* (Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education—SPICE 1988) by Sally Clark, Rod Hollingsworth, Robert Rudholm, and Stan Seaberg.

The remaining twenty-one items⁵ fail to give students a fair, honest accounting of what life without democratic rights is like. The overall picture presented in these materials leaves students with little sense that the people of China are not free, that the government's agencies of social control are pervasive, arbitrary, and beyond the rule of law, and that the Chinese people are not happy with this state of affairs. Nonetheless, the extent to which these materials fail varies greatly. Some soften or even applaud features of totalitarian rule. Others

offer no more than a lifeless sentence or two about the abuse and extent of Chinese state power. A few do venture, however timidly, into the less benign features of China under Communist rule, or else manage, however erratically, to ask students to intelligently discuss political rights or economic choices, though without providing sufficient facts to nourish such discussion. *China Workbook* (Columbia University's East Asian Curriculum Project), *Economic Choices: China After Mao* (SPICE) and the *World Past and Present* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) fall into this last category.

Since the Communist victory over the Nationalists in 1949, China has been a modern dictatorship of the extreme, totalitarian variety. The distinction is not trivial. (Whether this distinction should drive U.S. foreign policy is a matter of controversy, but that is a separate issue.) Traditional dictatorships have been narrowly political in nature, allowing the people to continue established practices of family life, commercial arrangements, and religious worship. Only when the power of the regime itself is challenged, whether in the form of hostile newspapers or rival political parties, does the government move to crush its opposition. Terrible and often bloody as such dictatorships are—the regime of Ferdinand Marcos is a good recent example—their aims are relatively confined: to perpetuate the regime in power and profit from its monopoly.

Totalitarian regimes, by contrast, have cosmic ambitions to fundamentally change human nature. They aspire to create the "new Nazi Man," the "new Soviet Man," the "new Maoist Man." Not only are political rivals outlawed; all features of traditional society—from religion and commerce to the most basic bonds of family—are seen as bothersome elements obstructing the way to total control by the state over the lives of individuals. An official ideology becomes the official faith, mandated teaching for every school, farm, factory, and office; its slogans and demands replace all others, and obedience to it paves the narrow road for upward mobility.

After the troops of Mao Zedong defeated the Nationalists, they launched a land reform program that included summary trials and the execution of some 5 million landlords and "rich peasants."⁶ Following land reform came other campaigns against counterrevolutionaries and "Rightists" in which millions more Chinese were killed. Of the twenty-eight textbooks and guides, twelve acknowledge these executions, with one text estimating the victims as "possibly as many as 2 million," another as "millions," a third as "about a million," another as "thousands," two others as "many," and the rest of the twelve using quite inaccurate characterizations such as "only the worst landlords" or landlords who were "not willing to give up their land" or who "resisted" the regime or "those who opposed the government" were put to death. In fact, the executions were

based on class or political status with people killed simply for having belonged to the "wrong" political party or the "wrong" economic class.

Nonetheless, landless peasants were given land in accordance with Communist promises, the country after years of civil war and chaos was united under a single authority, women were given rights of greater equality, and a mood of cautious optimism prevailed. But scarcely had the peasantry begun cultivating their land when Mao ordered them in 1953 to begin forming collectives and in 1958 compelled them to combine into even larger and more impersonal communes, neither of which measures the peasants wanted and to which they offered sullen but telling resistance. The success and popularity of the early achievements is conveyed by most of the materials; the disillusionment is not.

As part of his "Great Leap Forward" campaign, to catch up with the developed world, Mao in 1958 ordered peasants to create whole industries, to make steel in their villages, as if ideological commitment could take the place of technology and expertise and lead the peasants to perform miracles. In place of miracles, China reaped disaster. The diversion of energies from farming to "backyard iron foundries" in a country just barely feeding itself, the resulting chaos in the transport system, and, above all, directives from the party ordering peasants to use lunatic farming methods, produced famine. The *Cambridge History of China* puts the death toll at anywhere "from 16 million to 27 million" people,⁷ calling it "the most devastating famine of the twentieth century in China (and probably in the world)," for one must go back to the Chinese famine of 1877-78 when 9 to 13 million perished "to find a disaster on the scale of the Great Leap."

This terrible consequence of a dictator's whim surely deserves to be known by students learning about China. Yet of the twenty-eight textbooks and guides, only one gives an estimate of 20 to 30 million deaths, another says "millions died," and a third says there was "hunger." For the rest of the books, complete silence on this great famine reigns. (A textbook especially marked by errors of fact, *Exploring World Cultures*, affirms: "China has not had a famine since the Communists came to power.")

Another campaign dreamed up by Mao was the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," by which Mao sought to destroy the remnants of traditional Chinese culture (while conveniently crushing his Communist Party rivals and critics), but twenty texts say not a word about the orgy of persecution that struck—even in the estimate of China's official *People's Daily*—about 100 million people. Only one text among the exceptions goes so far as to cite that number.

SPICE's *Values in Conflict* offers a short story with one of the few graphic passages on the human toll of the Cultural Revolution:

Liang Xia was ten years old in 1966 when the Cultural Revolution began . . . Her father, a leader in his office, was dragged out one night by people who broke into their home. Then her mother was separated from her. Liang Xia, bewildered, was left alone at home, cooking meals to take to her parents . . . She did this until one day a man told her not to prepare any more for her father, since he had died five days earlier. . . . Because of her parents, she too was criticized from time to time. In those unhappy days, Liang Xia often dreamed that she was being weighed down by a heavy stone. Unable to remove it, she would cry herself awake. But in time she became accustomed to the sneers, and hid the hatred in her heart. After her mother was released, she accompanied her mother to a cadre school to do manual labor in the countryside.

The fictional Liang Xia reflects the reality of nearly 20 million city people deported to the poorest districts of the countryside (the largest forced movement of human beings in recorded history). Mao's frenzied young Red Guards killed, usually after torture, at minimum several hundred thousand⁸ persons, virtually none of whom was guilty of anything except having an education, having spent time in the West, or owning "bourgeois" books or records. Soon Red Guard factions were fighting among themselves as well, bringing the death toll to between 2 and 3 million in the judgment of Jürgen Domes in *The Government and Politics of the PRC* (Westview Press 1985). Some Chinese privately compare it to Europe's Holocaust. (When the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia launched a similar campaign a decade later that killed about a million people, one-sixth of the population, their inspiration was Mao's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.)

Only seven texts mention the deportations in any way, and in at least one case, *Teaching about World Cultures* (Center for Teaching International Relations [CTIR], University of Denver) the mention is favorable: "Students gained a greater respect for the peasants by actually taking part in farm labor and talking with them about the hardships of their life," and "they had a feeling of being an important part of 'building socialism' in China, of helping the nation to develop." A different picture emerges from those who endured the experience.

In *People and Our World* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston) by Allan Kownslar and Terry Smart, the photograph that accompanies the section on the Great Cultural Revolution (having said nothing about its human cost) shows smiling young men and women in uniform with Red Guard armbands, gesturing before a white statue of Mao. It bears the caption: "The Chinese government sent out dance groups, such as the one above, to teach about Mao and communism. How is [sic] media used today to spread political belief?"

Only two texts ever use the word "totalitarian" to describe the nature of the Chinese government. In neither book are details offered to make clear just what this means, and in one of them the text is otherwise a homage to the good life under totalitarian rule. A third text bravely uses the word "dictatorship." All others avoid such words perhaps from concern that they might provoke "negative stereotypes," against which teachers and students are constantly warned.

Few textbooks seriously examine China's legal system. One that does is *Global Studies: China* (Dushkin Group) by Suzanne Ogden. It includes an article by Otto Ulc, a Czech who is now a professor in the United States, who toured China to compare his experience as a judge in Czechoslovakia with the Chinese justice system. He found it to be completely subordinated to the state and the Party, and he asked Mr. Li, a former judge he met, "How did you feel after you had condemned an innocent person because the Party ordered you to do so?" Mr. Li tries to avoid answering, but finally concedes: "Yes, the innocent are bound to be liquidated; there is nothing that can be done about it. Law serves politics. Law serves politics," he repeated. Nothing comparable is found in other texts.

The instruments of political repression are very developed in China. The courts and prison camps represent only the terminus of the system. Much closer means for observing, shaping and controlling the lives of the people are provided by the work units and street committees.

As all urban Chinese know, the street committee is a funnel of information and control employed by the police. Nominally elected, members of street committees have their names put forward by the government's neighborhood office, and the voting that follows is not secret. Everyone knows how he is expected to vote.

"Their most terrifying power is that they can search your house whenever they want," confided one young couple, Hong and Weidong, to Fox Butterfield, the *New York Times* correspondent who wrote *China: Alive in the Bitter Sea* (Time Books 1982). "The police are supposed to have a warrant, but the street committee cadres can come in when they please." Usually middle-aged women, they may barge into one's apartment after midnight without knocking, to check on whether some relative from the countryside is sleeping over (not permitted) or to query guests invited to dinner or check on books or other articles one may own. "It's very humiliating," said Hong, the wife, regarding the chief committee woman's arrogance and power. "If you don't cooperate, she can call the police and they will come over and ask the same questions. . . . She even watches what time we go to bed," Hong complained. "We are like caged animals."

With the tough new birth-control policy, street committees even decide who may have a baby. "We assign a person to keep track of each woman's menstrual cycle," a street committee woman explained to Butterfield. "If someone misses her period and isn't scheduled to have a baby, we tell her to have an abortion."

As in most of the texts that even discuss the subject, *The World Today* (Heath Social Studies) describes the street committee in benign terms as persons who "put up posters to tell parents about shots that protect children from measles." In *Teaching about World Cultures* (CTIR), this instrument of social control is celebrated. In one of its activities titled: "Grassroots Government: The Neighborhood Committee," students are invited to solve problems the Chinese way. Nothing is said about the street committee's surveillance or control function. Instead, students are told that the street committee is a replacement for the extended family and is compared to "similar institutions in American culture" such as "neighborhood groups, churches, etc." So wonderful is the street committee that "other developing countries" with "similar social problems as a result of weakening family and tribal ties" ought to be encouraged, students are told, to follow the Chinese Communist way.

Only a handful of materials make any negative comment about the Communists' attack on the traditionally honored Chinese family. Several make benign reference to the change. As one guide (*All in the Family: China Old and New*, SPICE) says, "the family's functions have been reduced because of what the Communists felt to be an incompatibility between the building of a socialist industrial society and the traditional kinship orientation of the Chinese family." This guide notes that Chinese parents have less authority than they once did and that the model Chinese child "serves the people" and works for the betterment of the larger society." It does not note that these model children have been encouraged to publicly denounce and cause the imprisonment or even execution of their parents. *Exploring World Cultures* (Ginn and Co.) in a sidebar includes a "self-criticism" by a college student who showed hesitation in denouncing his father. The textbook then goes on to issue this singular judgment: "Several other changes made by the Communists also weakened the father's authority. . . . Children were encouraged to report parental disloyalty to the new China. Women and youth gained the most from these changes."

One of the most cruel assaults on family life—one that has continued under the rule of Deng Xiaoping—has been the government's indifference to the ties of marriage. Husband and wife may be assigned jobs in different parts of the country. Fox Butterfield met a man who had fallen in love with another university student and married her. They had lived together all of one month when the state labor bureau assigned them jobs in different cities. Even the birth of a child would not make the authorities relent. Once a year the man is granted two weeks, which

he combines with the six national holidays to see his wife and nine-year-old daughter. "My prime is passing me by," he confided, "and I'm still separated. My daughter knows me only as the man who brings presents once a year. How many years does one have to live?" A left-wing magazine in Hong Kong once estimated that some 8 million spouses in China are compelled by the state to live apart, merely from a Communist belief that private life and happiness are irrelevant beside the needs of the state. No text discusses this fact of Chinese life, not even the two teaching units that are solely devoted to teaching about "families."

"Equality" is often cited as a virtue that Mao's policies helped institutionalize. *People and Nations: A World History* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) by Mazour, Peoples and Rabb, is typical. The student learns that the Chinese Communists "wanted to create a classless society in which people worked for common goals, not for their private gain."

The truth of China's class system is rather different and is one of the best-kept secrets in the materials under review.

Simon Leys, a scholar who has reported on the horrors inaugurated by the Chinese Communists, notes in *Chinese Shadows* (Viking 1977) that in the sixth century B.C.E. China's social hierarchy, as described in the *Tso Chuan*, had only ten degrees. It now has twenty-four within the Communist Party alone, each with its special advantages and privileges as one goes up the ladder. The top rank gets ten times the salary of the bottom rank, but that is the least of it. As in other Communist countries, higher party officials have access to special stores for food, clothing, and appliances, stocked with items that ordinary Chinese only dream about. (One of the ways that the children of the party elite are identified by ordinary Chinese is that they are often taller than the average, thanks to the milk, meat, fruit, and vegetables their families have access to.) Special housing, sometimes on luxurious estates behind high walls, is provided the upper Communist crust. Cars are reserved exclusively for important persons and are used as a badge of privilege to enter places like the large hotels or special stores that are closed to ordinary Chinese.

This officially sanctioned inequality is exacerbated by the dismal output of China's centrally planned economy, racked as it is by awesome waste and inefficiency.⁹ Goods and services are often accessible only through the "back door," as the Chinese call it. The resulting resort to bribes has become a way of life, extending even to medicine, which is state controlled and supposed to be equally accessible to all. "Patients in my hospital have to line up three times," a physician told Butterfield. "You can spend the whole morning just waiting." He continued:

Many doctors are so busy they just make casual examination of the patient and then scribble something out. It's not good medicine and the patients know it. So many of the patients use the back door. If you know a doctor, you don't have to line up for him but just walk right into his room. He will give you better attention. Patients who have an even closer relationship with the doctor will go to see him at home, after hours. That's where the best care is. Of course, in exchange, the patients must give presents to the doctors.

Perhaps the most odious feature of China's class system has been the "bloodline" principle, by which children were branded for life according to classifications given their parents. A "good" class background is having parents who were poor peasants, workers, or best of all, Communists before the revolution. A "bad" class background is having parents who studied abroad, were landlords, business people, or had anything to do with the Nationalist Kuomintang. One's family background is traced for three generations (not unlike Nazi practice) and becomes part of a confidential dossier that the personnel section of every work unit maintains. Access to a university education, or to any of the better jobs, was long blocked by a "bad" class background. And yet some of the listings were absurd, with peasants who once owned a mere four acres and two pigs labelled "rich peasants" or even "landlords," their children's future thereby permanently damaged. Moreover, anonymous charges made for personal reasons can enter one's dossier and never be removed. Under Deng Xiaoping, through most of the 1980s, class background was disregarded and the dossier system, while never abandoned, was less harshly employed. With the recent political clampdown, however, the dossier system is in place and the bloodline information available whenever the government might wish to use them.

In none of the textbooks or teacher's guides are these forms of officially sanctioned inequality communicated to American students. Perhaps the textbook authors assume that the Chinese people, being "different" from ourselves, are not offended by such a range of institutionalized inequalities that border on a caste system. Yet at Fudan University in Shanghai, some brave journalism students locked the library and distributed questionnaires. To the question—"What is China's worst problem?"—60 percent listed *te-quan*. Special privileges.

Most of the materials cite equality for women as a progressive feature of Communist rule. For example, *World History* (Prentice-Hall) states, "In 1950, the government adopted a new marriage law that guaranteed women full equality." Even in the typical small village, one learns in *China* (Dushkin Group), "women no longer earn less than the men," and "79 percent of the wives have become the leading persons in their families."

The facts are somewhat at variance with this happy picture. It is true that backward conditions for women prevailed until 1950, when the new regime passed a liberal family law giving women freedom of choice in marriage, property rights, and the right to sue for divorce. Article 53 of the Constitution declares women equal to men in all respects. Most American textbooks suggest that this translates into genuine equality for women. Yet the Communist Party, which controls the entire society, had in 1981 a membership of three men for every woman, and the women are disproportionately at the bottom. Higher education is the only other ladder of meaningful social mobility, yet China's own Ministry of Education in the early 1980s found that while girls made up 50 percent of the primary school population, that figure dropped to 40 percent in high school and 30 percent by college. In 1980, according to the official New China News Agency, only 23 percent of Beijing University's incoming class was female.

The head of the All-China Women's Federation once complained at a meeting that 80 percent of China's illiterates were women, and that twice as many unemployed young women than men waiting for jobs were passed over.

Chinese women cannot choose to stay at home and raise their children. By law they must work. Yet day care is available only to a minority of parents. The law assures equal pay for equal work. But on visits to a dozen communes, Fox Butterfield found that men received about ten work points per day for work that paid women only seven or eight. Women are usually given the most backbreaking jobs while men serve as cadres or run the rare tractors. An American sociologist who lived on a commune in Hebei province, Steven Butler, estimated that women did 80 percent of the fieldwork.

To get married, a woman must first get approval from her work unit, or *danwei*. (The groom must get permission from his unit as well.) This all-powerful work unit, together with the street committee, is what gives the government such control over everyone. The right to live in a certain place or to travel or even to buy a bicycle is determined by the leaders of one's work unit, with favoritism rife.

Another crucial instrument of social control is China's system of residence permits. Only two texts inform students that freedom of movement is not extended to the people of China. The others wholly ignore the issue, leaving students to assume (why should they assume otherwise?) that their Chinese counterparts enjoy this basic right.

The "Follow-up Activity" offered at the end of the China section in Heath's *The World Today* reveals the ignorance or willful blindness of those who prepared it: "Tell students to imagine that they are young Chinese people about to finish high school. Ask them to write a paragraph describing the kind of work they

would like to do and where they would like to live." We take such choices for granted. But in China, these rights do not exist. Individuals cannot choose where to live. They cannot even choose their work.

CTIR's *Teaching about World Cultures* concedes these facts, then in its lyrically titled exercise "How Are You Going To Keep Them Down on The Farm," actually supports the Chinese system. Noting that "massive rural-urban migration" is observed in most developing countries, students are presented with a "case study and statistical data to make conclusions about the pull-push factors for the migration of Chinese peasants to the cities." Several alternative programs are presented for discouraging migration, and students are asked to choose one program and defend it. None of the proposed options respects the basic right of free movement, and students are not encouraged to consider options that do.

In short, students are asked to play the role of all-powerful party officials in a totalitarian state. Cities in the less-developed world are repeatedly cited as having endless problems due to the influx of peasants—in Mexico, India, Egypt, Brazil, Nigeria, and Japan—serving to steer the student toward the "sensible" solution of residence permits. (Significantly, South Africa is not mentioned, having a system of residence permits not unlike China's, but lacking the same "good image.") Students are not reminded that the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights specifically states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state." Only after the decision has been made, and as a sort of afterthought, are the students asked whether a government is entitled to prohibit movement in order to avoid "the problems of a Calcutta or a Mexico City."

(A question that might be asked, but never is, is: "Why did the democ... cies not need totalitarian measures to handle the urban influx, when a far greater shift from rural to urban living took place in the process of modernization?")

While the CTIR program represents an extreme, most of the texts reveal a troubling spirit of indifference to human rights in China. Few of their educated authors (most of them are university professors) seem aware of an organization called Amnesty International. The bulletins of Amnesty International make clear that China to this day has among the worst human rights abuses in the world, that persons are routinely sent to labor camps without trial, that execution often follows within days of arrest (rendering appeals impossible), that the present regime has sought to *speed up* the judicial process (when it occurs at all), that labor camps routinely "retain" a prisoner after the sentence is completed, using the "released" inmate as forced labor to help operate the camp. Not one of the twenty-eight texts properly describes these realities. Only three so much as glide over the subject.

Instead, several—including *China Mosaic* (East Asia Resource Center, University of Washington)—urge children to compare the American Bill of Rights with the rights afforded the Chinese under their Constitution. Since the latter includes (on paper, at any rate) “freedom of speech, of the press, of association, of procession and of demonstration” (Article 35), freedom of religion (Article 36), freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention (Article 37), and other basic rights, children are made to believe that in the realm of rights, the two nations differ little. Nothing is said regarding actual practice, except in this paragraph for the teacher:

Guide the students to an understanding that the American and Chinese Constitutions state ideals. Ask if they know of situations where the ideals have not been put into practice. An example would be the historic denial of voting rights to black Americans.

After the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, and with the rise of the current leader, Deng Xiaoping, aspects of the Cultural Revolution were denounced, the cult-worship of Mao was ended, the “Gang of Four,” allegedly responsible for the extremism of the Maoist era, were tried as scapegoats, and class struggle was deemphasized. These events and the economic changes inaugurated by Deng Xiaoping—greater scope for private initiative in small business and farming, a return to formal schooling to educate doctors and engineers, greater openness to the outside world in order to modernize Chinese industry—are reported in most texts as sensible developments.

In addition, during much of the 1980s, there was a relaxation of many government controls. The dossiers, the neighborhood committees, self-criticism, denunciations, and other tools of coercion were less frequently used. Policy toward the family was less hostile. Some greater freedom of expression was allowed. But the controls were never dismantled. When an invisible line was overstepped, the government could, and did, jerk the longer leash; those who had been outspoken would be dismissed from their posts or jailed, and other Chinese would find that much of the totalitarian machinery that had been switched to low-gear was once again fully operating.

These ongoing features of political repression go unnoticed in most of the texts for the simple reason that the whole subject in most cases has been ignored. The impression is left that a great deal more has been reformed than is in fact the case. Simon Leys in the *Burning Forest* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1986) wrote in 1981 about the changes wrought by Deng Xiaoping:

The downfall of the “Gang of Four,” however momentous, was, after all, a mere episode in the power struggle within the system—it did not bring

a significant modification of the system. . . . At no stage was any *politically meaningful* criticism and analysis allowed to develop; the basic questions (From where did the "Gang" derive its power? What kind of regime is it that provides opportunities for such characters to reach supreme power? How should the system be reformed to prevent similar occurrences in the future?) cannot be raised; whenever clear-sighted and courageous people dare to address these issues (Wang Xizhe, Wei Jingsheng), they are immediately gagged and disappear into the Chinese "Gulag."

The failure to ask questions about freedom, democracy, and human rights displayed by most materials is stunning and bewildering and constitutes very poor education. The indifference of the authors and publishers involved to matters of basic rights has caused them to miss one of the great stories of our time: the outbreak of the Democracy Movement in China.

- On April 5, 1976, 100,000 people in Beijing's Square of the Gate of Heavenly Peace turned the commemoration of Zhou Enlai into a massive protest against the government.
- On December 5, 1978, Wei Jingsheng, then China's best-known dissident, posted a sensational document on the short-lived Democracy Wall in Beijing entitled "The Fifth Modernization: Democracy" (taking off on Deng's Four Modernizations). It said such things as:

The people need democracy. When they demand democracy, they simply demand that which originally belonged to them.

Go and ask the workers: "Apart from the wretched salary that you are given every month, just to prevent you from starving, what rights do you have? What power do you have? Whose masters are you? Alas, you can control nothing—not even your own marriage!"

The struggle of modern times is a struggle to achieve the maximum degree of freedom and democracy that mankind can contemplate.

Wei was given a one-day trial and disappeared into the Chinese gulag.

- In the autumn of 1980, a brief political thaw occurred when it seemed that Deng would allow the people to have serious, contested elections at the local level. As with a comparable thaw under Mao (the brief One Hundred Flowers Period), repression followed soon afterward. But in the interval, telling incidents revealed the deeper aspirations of the Chinese. At Beijing University, a former

Red Guard named Fang Zhiyuan held a campaign rally where 500 students packed a room intended for 200 and provoked applause by saying that he didn't think China was a socialist country. Public ownership of the means of production is not enough, said Fang. "To say something is truly publicly owned, we must see if the leaders represent the interests of the people. To have this, you need a system, and that system is democracy." The audience erupted in wild approval.

- At the Hunan Normal College in Changsha, Liang Heng (who later with his American wife Judith Shapiro wrote a remarkable book, *Son of the Revolution*, Vintage 1984), publicly campaigned on statements that he no longer believed in Marxism. Seeing that he would win, the government tried to rig the election, which provoked a hunger strike of eighty students at the college with another 5,000 joining in a sit-in demonstration at the Changsha Party headquarters. They were protesting standard Party interference in the election of deputies at the college. Many of the protesters were shouting, "Down the bureaucracy, down with feudalism, long live democracy!"
- In December 1986, thousands of students in Beijing, Shanghai, and other cities across China demonstrated in the streets calling for some measure of political democracy.

These events, whose historical importance is obvious, are referred to briefly in three books and are wholly absent from the other twenty-five. These protests, which began in 1976, make the recent demonstration of this spring in Tiananmen Square fully comprehensible. The original aim of the students is too easily forgotten: They wanted to celebrate the seventieth anniversary of the Beijing student demonstration of May 4, 1919, calling for democracy and triggering similar student demonstrations all over China.

How could textbook authors miss this story? What inspires such an omission?

As noted earlier, the field of international/global education is animated by doctrines that denounce "Ethnocentrism" and encourage students to lay aside own values as they study other cultures. Typical is the grade-seven text *World Cultures and Geography* (The Center for Learning by Artis, Costello and Miltner 1987), which tells teachers in the section titled "Ethnocentricity" that "it is helpful to assist students in emptying their minds of the cultural perspective that they bring to such a study." In *Teaching about Cultural Awareness* (CTIR), Gary Smith and George Otero underline that human diversity means "that we cannot simply develop a codebook for any culture's behavior," that "to assume that there is one proper way to behave toward all human beings is both naive and unworkable."

The Education Department of the State of New York published last year *Social Studies 9-10: Global Studies*, a preliminary syllabus for teachers, which includes in its directives the requirement that "each student will develop the ability to understand, respect and accept people of different . . . political, economic and social backgrounds, *and their values, beliefs and attitudes*" (emphasis added). Yet students are also required to learn the values "necessary to participate in democratic self-government." The authors, apparently, do not see the contradiction. The problem lies in the fact that most societies in this world are not democratic.

The San Diego school system also publishes guidelines for global education: "Students will demonstrate an understanding and appreciation for the fact that individual cultures and societies, past and present, have developed lifestyles and viewpoints that are appropriate to their particular needs, wants, and desires."¹⁰ Did the authors think of South Africa when they wrote that? Of Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge?

There is no doubt that children are prone to look askance at whatever they find strange, including cultural differences in dress, cooking and accepted manners. For many reasons—not least those of ethnic and religious pluralism that define the United States as a culture—the cosmopolitan values of tolerance and appreciation of differences are plainly values that our schools should encourage. But there is a line that we draw when different "customs" and different cultural "tastes" pass over into barbarous practice. As former U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick has said, few will agree "that cannibalism is only a matter of taste, that Auschwitz reflects an alternative approach to race relations, that infanticide is a somewhat archaic but nonetheless effective mode of family planning, that slavery is an alternative view of how to get a society's work done."

Some educators make the argument that democratic rights are a luxury that poor nations cannot afford. But the evidence by now is overwhelming that this is an absurd dichotomy. Freedom and democracy do not cost a people food and clothing and prosperity; they *generate* the goods that constitute prosperity. Simon Leys has aptly put it in *The Burning Forest*: "Totalitarianism, far from being a drastic remedy that could be justified in a national emergency, appears on the contrary to be an extravagant luxury which no poor country can afford with impunity."

But neither of these rationales fully explains the silence on human rights and the struggle for democracy in China that goes back at least to Sun Yat-sen. The very textbooks that say nothing about the absence of basic rights in China have no difficulty judging Nazi Germany or denouncing the absence of basic rights in South Africa. *People and Our World* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston) accurately

informs the student that "under apartheid, Blacks are not allowed to vote in elections or hold any important or high governmental or business positions," that in 1974 "the South African government had an estimated 800 political prisoners in its jails." Why, suddenly, is an exception made to the doctrine that nations have constructed systems "appropriate to their particular needs"? What about such matters as they apply to China? This double standard also obtains in *People and Nations* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) where, as in the Holt Rinehart textbook, Cuba is treated kindly—despite being a dictatorship with a deplorable human rights record—whereas Chile under Pinochet, like South Africa, is judged by democratic standards. Are tyrannies of the left—at least those still idealized by utopia-seekers—immune from standards applied to tyrannies of the right? So it seems.

Whatever their reasons, by suggesting that some people in other places are less desirous or deserving of democratic rights, these creators of global/international education materials are, quite simply, repudiating the universal basis of human rights. They are repudiating the terms of the Declaration of Independence, which affirms that all men are created equal. They are repudiating France's Declaration of the Rights of Man, not to mention the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Oddly enough, there is something perversely ethnocentric in the idea that human rights are a peculiarity of Americans, British, French, and Scandinavians. As Simon Leys has put it, this "amounts to saying: 'Human rights are one of those luxuries that befit us wealthy and advanced Westerners; it is preposterous that mere natives of exotic countries could qualify for a similar privilege, or would even be interested in it.'" There is enormous condescension, bordering on racism, in the theory that people in other places do not have the same aspirations to speak their mind, travel, move, work at what they wish, marry, have children, be judged as individuals and not for the alleged crimes of their parents, and finally, to choose their leaders and the form of government under which they will live.

International education should be animated by the ideals of freedom and democracy on which our society rests and to which people everywhere aspire. These ideals and principles order our civic life, and yet they are not biologically innate. They are learned ideals. If governments by and for the people are to last, schools must teach successive generations what these principles mean. There is nothing uniquely "white" or "English" about them. They are universal in significance and are cherished by people of every color, faith, and background. To call them "ethnocentric" is an affront to our diverse population that came to these shores, often in flight from persecutions and pogroms, from every corner of the globe.

International education belongs in any meaningful curriculum. Surveys show that American students are lamentably ill-informed about the world. But if other areas of the world are as badly handled as China (and there is reason to fear they are), a wholesale review of the field's operating assumptions is very much overdue.

In late 1978, Fox Butterfield entered China on a tourist visa, during the early stages of the Democracy Movement. On the People's Square in downtown Shanghai, a crowd of ten thousand people surged around three sides of an empty building. Its walls were covered with posters. The crowd moved "excitedly, almost euphorically" around the building like a surf "carrying me from one spot to another. Every time I tried to get close enough to read a poster, I would be swept off in another direction." Some posters were on single sheets torn from a school notebook, others were on old newspaper pages. The largest was on twenty-nine sheets of white paper fifteen feet tall, bearing the title, "Human Rights and Democracy." As Butterfield was reading the start of it, a young man grabbed his arm—was he an American? Then he should see this, as he pulled the correspondent to a subsequent sheet of the poster.

The phrases seemed oddly familiar, as if I had heard them before, but it took several minutes to translate the Chinese back into its original English. It was the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness . . .

"In 1776 in the American Revolution," the poster went on, "the Declaration of Independence for the first time in the history of mankind spoke about people's right to live as human beings. We ought to have these rights too, not to be the emperor's slaves."

Do the Chinese have something to teach us? Yes, they do. They remind us that armed frontiers cannot stop the democratic ideal and that the desire for human rights is universal. This is a lesson plain from China to Poland to South Africa. When textbook authors and publishers learn it, our children will get the schoolbooks they deserve.

Notes

1. The global education field is not well organized. Though a rigorous effort was made to identify the most recommended materials, it is possible that something has been missed.

2. *China Mosaic and Letters from Chengdu*, published by the University of Washington's East Asia Resource Center, and *A Children's Palace* published by the University of Illinois' Center for Asian Studies.

3. This text should not be confused with the Scott, Foresman & Co. book bearing the same title.

4. While this text meets the minimal standard of truth-telling set forth here, it should be pointed out that it devotes a total of only twelve paragraphs to Revolutionary China and, if judged on general criteria such as depth or writing quality, it would certainly be found wanting.

5. The twenty-one books arranged alphabetically by publisher are: *Changing Images of China* (Center for Teaching International Relations, University of Denver 1986) by Michelle Sanborn, Rachel Roe, and Heidi Hursh; *Teaching about World Cultures* (CTIR 1986) by John Beneger, Jacquelyn Johnson, and Huang Teh-ming; *China Workbook* (Columbia University East Asian Curriculum Project); *China Connections* (Community Learning Connections, Boston, Mass. 1985); *The World Today* (D.C. Heath & Co. 1987) by Gloria Hagans, Barbara Recque, and Richard Wilson; *Exploring World Cultures* (Ginn & Co. 1988) by Esko E. Newhill and Umberto La Paglia; *People and Nations: A World History* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1987) by Anatole Mazour, John Peoples, and Theodore Rabb; *The World: Past and Present* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1988) by Stephanie Hirsh and Phillip Bacon; *People and Our World* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1984) by Allan Kownslar and Terry Smart; *The World* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1986) by JoAnn Cangemi; *Global Insights* (Merrill Publishing 1987) by Hantula, Flickema, Farah, Karls, Johnson, Thuermer, Resnick, and Kane; *World History: Patterns of Civilization* (Prentice Hall 1988) by Burton F. Beers; *All in the Family: China Old and New* (Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education SPICE); *Contemporary Family Life in China* (SPICE 1982); *Economic Choices: China After Mao* (SPICE 1988); *Education in The People's Republic of China* (SPICE 1982); *Rural Development in China* (SPICE 1987) by Michael Chang, Patricia Irle, Charles Lewis, Bing Shaw and Helen Strate; *Teaching About a Changing China* (SPICE reprint of February 1986 edition of *Social Education*); *A Children's Palace* (Center for Asian Studies, University of Illinois, Urbana 1986) by Michele Shoresman and Roberta Gumpert; *China Mosaic* (University of Washington, East Asia Resource Center 1988) by Mary Bernson; *Letters from Chengdu* (University of Washington, East Asia Resource Center 1989) by Richard Moulden and Mary Bernson.

6. Scholar Jürgen Domes in *The Internal Politics of China 1949-1972* (Praeger 1973) states that "in the course of the land reform movement" alone, "cautious estimates put the dead at no less than 5 million."

7. *The Cambridge History of China* (Cambridge University Press 1987) Volume 14 cites the study by Ansley Coale, *Rapid Population Change in China 1952-1982* (National Academy of Sciences), which estimates the deaths at 27 million; Jürgen Domes in *The Government and Politics of the PRC* (Westview Press 1985) cites the estimate of Roderick MacFarquhar in *The Great Leap Forward* (Oxford University Press) of 16.5 to 29.4 million deaths.

8. In January 1976, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ch'en Yi, in a "self-criticism" speech, said that in the summer and autumn of 1967 alone more than four hundred thousand members of "work teams" had been executed (Domes, *The Internal Politics of China*). Both Roger Garside in *Coming Alive: China After Mao* (McGraw-Hill 1981) and Fox Butterfield in *China: Alive in the Bitter Sea* (Times Books 1982) cite an official government source reported by *Agence France Presse* in February 1979 as giving the figure of four hundred thousand deaths.

9. Revealing details about apartment complexes that are unusable and empty, about new factories that stand incomplete or do not operate or operate one or two days a week can be found in Fox Butterfield's book on China.

10. *Gloped: Comparative Political and Economic Systems* (San Diego City Schools 1986) by Robert Borntrager and Duenise Shute.

What American Students Should Know About the World

Owen Harries

As far as understanding the world is concerned, American students labor under two disabilities: First, they are American; second, they are students—and therefore for the most part young.

To avoid any suggestion of anti-Americanism, let me make it clear that being American is a disability in the same sense that being an Australian is—and that being, say, a Pole or an Israeli is not. Poles and Israelis live in an environment where there is little scope for illusion, self-indulgence, or misunderstanding. When fate has thoughtfully provided Russians as one of your neighbors and Germans as the other—or hostile Arabs all around you—you don't really need special lessons in international politics. Your life is the lesson.

If, on the other hand, you live in a very large, rich country that is insulated from the rest of the world by vast oceans and great distance; if your neighbors are either too nice or too weak to threaten you; if you have never been invaded or had your mainland directly attacked in any serious way by foreigners for the last 177 years—as is the case with Americans—then the realities of international affairs may well pass you by, and you will be in need of instruction.

Being a student and therefore young constitutes a disability because of the difficulty experienced at that stage in life in distinguishing between IS and OUGHT; between one's own wishes and desires, on the one hand, and the world as something that exists independently of oneself, on the other.

Western adolescents have difficulty in distinguishing where they themselves end and a hard, intractable world begins. They tend to be solipsistic. Further, they tend to be utopian and moralistic, to focus on ends at the expense of means, principles at the expense of circumstances. And, as is usual with utopians, when their expectations are disappointed—as they regularly and necessarily are—they tend to swing violently to cynicism; utopianism and cynicism being different sides of the same coin, in that they both represent a violent negative reaction to reality.

To say this is to say that, on the whole and with of course notable exceptions, the young have difficulty with complexity and gray areas. They tend to lack what Scott Fitzgerald maintained is the test of a first rate intelligence: the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function effectively.

Developing that capacity should, I believe, be a principal aim in teaching students about the world.

Some examples of what I have in mind.

(1) American students have some experience of how politics work in the United States. They know, too, if rather vaguely, that there is also something called international politics. It is natural for them to start by assuming that the two are very much alike, that they operate on the same principles. And in some respects, of course, they are and they do. Both involve the pursuit of interests, the use of power, authority, the application of general principles to particular cases, and so on. But there is one crucial difference. Politics in the United States—and indeed in every other state—occurs within a polity and in the presence of a sovereign government, which has the allegiance of the individuals and groups involved, which acts as arbiter or umpire between competing forces, and which can authoritatively implement the decisions reached.

That is not the case with international politics, which take place in a state of anarchy—using that term in its strict sense of an absence of government. There is no world (or international) state or government. On the contrary each of the 160 or so states which participate in world politics claims to be sovereign and recognizes no power superior to itself. And despite much glib talk about "the global village," any sense of a world community is weak and anemic—certainly when compared to the reality of national communities. There are no common loyalties and values; on the contrary there are sharply conflicting ones.

That is a huge difference and it is vital to grasp it if one is to make sense of international politics. In international politics there is no supreme authority to enforce rules and decisions, to arbitrate between parties, to hold the ring in the

case of disputes. While there is something called International Law, it differs from the law in states because there is no one to enforce it. The United Nations has no means of enforcing its will and is not a government. In the absence of anything else—a sense of legitimate authority, a common loyalty, a shared morality—power is the principal arbiter. The power, that is, of individual actors. That is the peculiar sense in which international politics is "power politics." Someone has put it more epigrammatically: "When there is no agreement about what suit is trumps, clubs are always trumps." Clubs are always trumps in international politics.

I would say that if there is one thing that it is essential to convey clearly to students, that fact is it. It should even be exaggerated and put very starkly initially, to make the point decisively—qualifications can come later.

(2) A second thing that any teaching about the world and America's place in it should be concerned to convey is the relationship between ends and means.

This is especially important because the young tend to be idealistic and grandiose about ends in world affairs, but to be resistant or hostile towards addressing the question of the necessary means—which usually involve the use of power (charitable rock concerts, holding hands around the Mall, letters to the editors, while they may boost egos and induce a sense of virtue, will not usually do the trick in terms of changing the world).

The question of ends and means was definitely and succinctly put by Walter Lippmann in the first chapter of his famous little book on *U.S. Foreign Policy*, written nearly fifty years ago:

Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purpose, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign policy.

And again:

In foreign relations we have habitually in our minds divorced the discussion of our war aims, our peace aims, our ideals, our interests, our commitments, from the discussion of our armaments, our strategic positions, and potential allies and our probable enemies. No policy could emerge from such a discussion. For what settles practical controversy is the knowledge that ends and means have to be balanced: an agreement has eventually to be reached when men admit that they must pay for what they want and that they must want only what they are willing to pay for.

A simple but absolutely basic point—but one regularly ignored, and as valid today as when Lippmann wrote. Consider for example, the 1989 issue of Panama. Many Americans wanted to see Noriega go; yet many of the same people objected to the one thing that got rid of him—the decisive use of American power. It is not a matter of one view being right and the other wrong; merely that there is a disjunction between the two so that, as Lippmann says, no effective policy can result. It would be a signal service, and that would improve the level of debate on world affairs immeasurably, if a generation of American students were required to memorize and understand Lippmann's words.

(3) A related and equally important relationship that is essential for understanding the world is that between principles and circumstances, for it bears directly on the difficult and important question of morality in international affairs.

Americans like to approach international affairs and foreign policy in terms of moral principles, usually formulated in doctrinal form—the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine, the Eisenhower Doctrine, right down to the Reagan Doctrine. It is a feature of the American tradition.

It is also a feature of those who espouse principles and doctrines that they demand consistency in their application, and denounce as hypocritical and cynical and opportunistic any deviation from principle. The dreaded charge of "double standards" is raised.

As consistency is in practice both impossible and undesirable, the result is that many Americans—and particularly the idealistic young—are turned off from international affairs and alienated from their government.

I would argue that this is because their thinking about the relationship between principles and policy is shallow, simplistic, and untutored. In Scott Fitzgerald's terms, they have not been taught to hold two opposed ideas—the idea of morality and the idea of power and self interest—in their minds at the same time.

The subject is a complicated one, but two central points can be made briefly.

First, the United States pursues not one moral goal but many—freedom, justice, peace, the material well-being of people, democracy and order among them. All these goals are not always in harmony; sometimes some of them are in conflict. When that happens choices have to be made, priorities have to be established, among different "goods"—and these will vary from case to case. Should the U.S. have supported the Hungarian independence movement in 1956, even if it endangered world peace? Should the U.S. support the drive for

democracy in China today, even if it might result in internal chaos and violence or make an enemy of the Chinese government? How to measure the possible gains (in terms of weakening apartheid) against the certain costs (in terms of lost jobs for poor Africans) that will result from maintaining sanctions against South Africa?

These are genuinely difficult questions requiring fine political and moral judgment. They cannot be answered by the simple application of a doctrine and surrender to "consistency." For as one of the most distinguished political philosophers of our time—Sir Isaiah Berlin—has put it, "The necessity of choosing between absolute claims is an unescapable characteristic of the human condition." We all do it every day. Why then should we expect it to be different for a state and a government?

Second, quite apart from the conflict between moral goals, there is the question of circumstances: what can, and cannot be achieved in a given set of circumstances. Good intentions are not good enough. A well-meaning man or government who acts in ignorance of the circumstances and in blind obedience to a principle can create terrible havoc (a point that Graham Greene labored to make in his novel *The Quiet American*, written in 1956 and set in Southeast Asia—and which Edmund Burke had made over a century and a half earlier when he said, "The circumstances are what render every civil or political scheme beneficial or noxious to mankind").

Instead of being encouraged in a facile moralism, therefore, American students should be initiated into the difficulty of moral judgment—should be made to understand that having one's moral pronouncements taken seriously is a right to be earned through knowledge and reflection, not a matter of "feel-good" self-indulgence.

One last suggestion: It would be very useful if American students were taught to think seriously about the question of peace, rather than simply to emote on the subject. As a start, they could be invited to think seriously about remarks made by two outstanding men of very different persuasions. Churchill in the 1930s observed that "Peace is not a policy"; Lenin during World War I observed that all the participants were in favor of peace in general. What did they mean?

For one thing, that peace is not and cannot be the overriding end of policy. If it was, there would never be a problem—because you can always secure peace by surrendering, by giving your opponent what he wants. Second, while everyone may, in a sense, want peace, they do not want the same peace, not peace under the same conditions. In 1940, the ultimate objective of both Hitler and Churchill was peace in Europe. But Hitler wanted a peaceful Europe under Nazi domination

while Churchill wanted peace and the restoration of the integrity of its nation states. This is why the claim, frequently heard, that as everyone wants peace there is a basic harmony of interests—and conflict is the result of misunderstanding—is dangerously false.

For these reasons, among others, to elevate peace into a supreme end is an error. It is to advocate a policy that cannot be sustained, and which may in fact make war more rather than less likely. Again, Lippmann made the point when he wrote of "the vicious circle of pacifism":

In the name of peace the nation is made weak and unwilling to defend its vital interests. Confronted with the menace of superior force it then surrenders its vital interests. The pacifist statesmen justify their surrender on the ground, first, that peace is always preferable to war, and second, that because the nation wants peace so much, it is not prepared to wage war. Finally, with its back to the wall, the pacifist nation has to fight nevertheless. But then it fights a strategically superior enemy; it fights with its own armaments insufficient and with its alliances shattered.

When discussing peace, teachers might also address the currently fashionable concept of "interdependence," which holds—probably rightly—that the affairs of countries are now more intertwined than ever before. For a widely prevalent view is that increasing interdependence rationally rules out war. This is, to say the least, dubious. The most interdependent social arrangement every devised by mankind is the family; but it is within the family that most murders occur. Worth remembering. In fact, the countries of Europe were more interdependent—more bound together by commerce and communication—in 1914, on the eve of the Great War, than they had ever been before.

These, then, are some of the things that it seems to me should be taught to American students about the world. They are going to be increasingly important in the coming years, as the world moves rapidly from the simple bipolarity of the Cold War to a more complex, volatile and ambiguous multipolar, interdependent world—the kind of world in which the United States has little experience as an active great power, and which requires considerable hard-headedness and sophistication if one is to keep afloat.

I take it for granted that students should be taught the facts of history, geography, demography, economics and so on. But unless they are also taught to *think* coherently and seriously as well, those facts will not do them much good. That, of course, raises the question of who is going to teach their teachers to think, and by what process that is to be achieved. But those are different questions.

Conclusion

John Fonte and André Ryerson

The preceding essays have set forth the major issues and arguments of the "educational conversation" over international and global studies in America's schools, colleges, public policy institutions, and among our citizenry in general. This conversation is just beginning. It is likely to develop, expand and intensify in the decades to come. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected and our country grows more culturally diverse, the problems analyzed here will become even more critical to America's future and its role in world affairs.

This collection of essays from educators and scholars informs us that there are no easy answers or ready solutions to educating for the future. In the final analysis these problems are integral to democratic citizenship, thus to the choices that a self-governing free people must ultimately make. We conclude with three themes that we hope will be helpful as the conversation over international education continues to develop. These themes are:

- (1) *Content*, (2) *Judgment*, and (3) *Balance*.

(1) Content

Education for America's role in world affairs must begin by recognizing the centrality of content. To understand the world and America's role in it, one must first know something about America and the world. There is no substitute for content. To many this may seem obvious and belabored, but a knowledge-based framework in international and global education has often been ignored or

deemphasized in favor of a more subjective approach that focuses on feelings and attitudes. Crucial to sound international education are the academic domains of history, geography, economics, international relations, comparative government and foreign languages.

(A) History, International Relations and Comparative Government. To understand America's role in the world requires knowing the historical context in which the United States emerged as a major actor in world affairs. Indeed, one must understand the salient events of the 20th century and how they affected our lives in order to fully grasp the challenges of the future: Why did the United States and its allies fight several wars and engage in a worldwide "cold" war against varied totalitarian states for a good part of this century? What is the significance of decolonization and the emergence of the "Third World" on the global scene after World War II? How has the international economic order established four and-a-half decades ago, the "Bretton Woods System," affected world trade and global development?

To comprehend these and other key issues it is essential to study the political, intellectual, social, cultural, and economic history of the 20th century. This includes two world wars of immense destruction; the emergence of new types of repressive regimes such as Hitler's Germany, Stalin's USSR, Mao's China, Pol Pot's Cambodia; the growth of urbanization and the decline of rural life; the explosion of new technologies and inventions from atomic energy and space exploration to the computer; the growth and increasing interdependence of the global economic marketplace; and the conflicts over modernization in traditional societies such as Turkey in the 1920s and 1930s, Iran from the 1970s through the 1990s. To understand Havel, Walesa, Mandela, Gorbachev, Yeltsin, European integration, German unification, the East Asian economic "tigers," and the growth of democracy in Latin America, Asia and Africa, one must first know something about Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Churchill, Gandhi, Nehru, Nasser, the trade policies of the industrialized world and the durability and success of the NATO alliance. It would even help to know what separates the philosophy of Marx from that of Montesquieu, Madison and Adam Smith.

A unifying theme in many of the essays in this volume is the crucial distinction between democratic and undemocratic societies. Besides myriad armed struggles, the twentieth century has witnessed intense conflicts in the realm of ideas between liberal constitutional democracy and varied non-democratic world views. In both the industrialized and developing worlds this competition of ideas and the growth of liberal democratic institutions will continue to affect America's role in world affairs as we enter the 21st century.

(B) Geography and Economics. In addition to history, international relations and comparative government, the study of geography and economics is crucial to sound international education. In geography, first and foremost, students at the pre-collegiate level should be able to read contemporary and historical maps and understand their physical, cultural, climatic, economic and demographic features. Political and economic geography are particularly helpful for understanding the linkage of international issues. For example, to comprehend the global significance of the Straits of Hormuz one needs to appreciate links joining global economics (the vulnerability of the Western oil supply), international politics (the Iran-Iraq rivalry, the precarious position of the pro-Western Persian Gulf States), regional history and culture (the impact of Shiite fundamentalism), security issues (the projection of U.S. and Western naval power, state sponsored terrorism), diplomacy and economic alliances (the role of the U.N., the history of OPEC), and other factors.

The study of economics is critical for understanding how the world works. International education should examine the major competing economic systems during the past century in both theory and practice including communism, socialism, autarky, and mercantilism, feudalism, slavery, tribal economics, mixed economies, and free market democratic capitalism. Historical analysis comparing the successes and failures of different economic systems should undergird education for America's role in world affairs. Questions to be asked are: Why are some countries with few natural resources affluent and other nations with abundant natural resources poor? How is wealth created? What policies have led to economic successes? To economic failures? How is the post World War II Bretton Woods global economic system organized? What are the assumptions and presuppositions behind it? What are the major arguments for and against free trade?

(C) Foreign Languages. Finally, the study of foreign languages is a vital part of the *content* of international education. There is no doubt that foreign language study opens the door to understanding other cultures and peoples, their perspectives and their *mentalité*. Increased foreign language study has been strongly endorsed by our nation's political and business leaders, and is part of the "National Goals in Education" statement signed by the President and all fifty state governors. Major corporate executives have advocated more language learning in order to make America more competitive in the world. And plainly, foreign language study serves the traditional goals of the humanities by enriching the mind and imagination through the study of human diversity at its very root.

(2) Judgment

Along with an emphasis on learning essential knowledge about the world beyond our borders, international education should stress the importance of developing in teachers, students and citizens alike qualities of mature judgment about world affairs. The essay by Ambassador Owen Harries addresses this point directly. Harries notes that in addition to acquiring the academic content of international education, Americans need to understand two crucial concepts to develop a capacity for judgment about global issues and international politics.

First, they should grasp the enormous difference between the relatively stable arena of American domestic politics and the anarchic and violence-prone world of international power politics where "despite much glib talk about a global village" there is little consensus about basic values, the uses of power, and the nature of authority.

Second, they should be aware of the very complex relationship in the conduct of international relations between means and ends, principles and circumstances. While the United States pursues many goals such as freedom, justice, peace, prosperity and national interest, it is obvious that these goals are not always in harmony. American leaders must therefore make difficult choices based on finely-nuanced political and moral judgments. They cannot simply be "consistent." Always supporting peace or stability could be in conflict at times with other important goals such as freedom and justice. What is required, Harries insists, is judgment, not rote consistency or the application of a single criterium.

We believe that Ambassador Harries is essentially correct. But judgment is not innate. Sound judgment is based on historical knowledge fostered by the disciplines of inquiry, discernment, and solid academic content. Sound judgment draws crucial distinctions and eschews mechanistic and "determinist" approaches. International education should recognize that world events do not flow inevitably from material conditions and impersonal forces, but rather result from many different causes including conscious human actions for good and ill that are hard to predict and the consequences of which are not always evident. Yet neither are they beyond the grasp of reasoned inquiry. Let us clarify this point by analyzing the concept of change.

"Change" is one of the most important concepts in international/global education and, indeed, in the social studies generally. There are constant references by global and social educators to the need to "manage change" or the necessity of "adapting to change." But "change" does not make sense outside of a chronological context of history, geography, and the existential fact of human choice. Least of all is it a force beyond our grasp and before which we must

kneel. Fascism, communism, democracy, Islamic fundamentalism have all represented "change" at one time or another; so, of course, has socialism, state capitalism, market capitalism and many other political and economic systems. "Change" in the Germany of 1933 meant the ascension of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi party to power. In 1945 "change" in Germany meant the death of Hitler and the collapse of National Socialism. "Change" in Iran in 1953 meant the overthrow of the nationalist regime of Mossedegh and the coming to power of the Shah. In 1979 "change" meant the fall of the Shah and the beginning of the Islamic revolutionary government. Thus stock formulations such as the need to "manage" or "adapt" to change posited ahistorically do not help develop qualities of judgment in students and can, in fact, be counterproductive. Even more significantly, "change" represents only one side of the conceptual coin; the other side is continuity. Indeed, the Bradley Commission on History in the Schools (a major task force composed of leading professional historians and high school teachers) recommended that "courses in history, geography, and government" be designed to help students "comprehend the interplay of change and continuity, and avoid assuming that either is somehow more natural, or more to be expected, than the other."

The Bradley Commission noted that the study of history in particular, "can best help [students] deal with change and at the same time to identify the deep continuities that link past and present." Any historical change carries with it the seeds of continuity. Thus the current Islamic revolutionary government in Iran is linked by deep continuities to the regime of the 16th century Persian military-religious leader, Isma'il Safavi, and with the controversies that surrounded the ascendancy of the Shi'a version of the Muslim faith in Persia four hundred years ago. Recent changes in Central and Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union, remind us that long standing continuities endure. Some of these continuities are unpleasant, such as the perpetuation of centuries old antagonisms between Bulgarians and Turks, Serbians and Croatians; but other continuities are life affirming and inspiring, such as the persistence of the spirit of liberty and religious faith among Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Germans, Russians and other Eastern and Central Europeans despite many long decades of totalitarian oppression. It is clear that at times old concepts, beliefs, rivalries, and perspectives often dismissed as "obsolete" and anachronistic become "new" and important and, therefore, subjects that must be examined in a serious manner.

For many years international educators have stressed the importance of "problem solving." They have suggested that classes in international education seek "solutions" to global problems. This approach is usually predicated on the largely unquestioned assumption that a commonality of interests, perceptions and values exists among competing and even antagonistic parties—whether nation states or transnational actors—on different sides (and even on the same side) of

global disputes. The "solutions" recommended are often at odds with the ethos and experience of the American people, and many curricular materials give little evidence of knowing how free people go about settling upon solutions. In some cases there are no easy or undisputed solutions to global problems. Despite glib formulations to the contrary there are relatively few "win-win" solutions. Instead of "solutions" there are more likely to be *trade-offs* based on different interests, power relationships, and philosophical perspectives that will in turn create new sets of problems requiring attention and more trade-offs. Consider how the end of the cold war has created new or previously unconsidered problems among former allies and adversaries alike; or how industrializing the Third World to relieve poverty challenges environmental values. What is required to improve education for America's role in world affairs is not an emphasis on facile "problem solving," but the formation of knowledge and understanding of international issues that develops sound judgment in our citizens and permits a mature approach to policy.

(3) *Balance*

In the last two decades "controversial subject-matter" has come close to achieving the status of a sacred cow in the social studies generally, and global/international education in particular. Traditional teaching, it is true, shied away from any contact with controversial topics to an extent we might judge unnatural today. Yet the discretion of an earlier age was not just a matter of conventional thinking and low levels of instructional originality. It proceeded from assumptions about the obligation of schools to the public, assumptions of considerable merit which need clearer articulation now. Simply put, it is the principle that publicly funded institutions, including public schools, belong to the people as a whole, and so must serve the people as a whole. It is therefore not appropriate that schools be made the instruments of any political subgroup of the population seeking to proselytize children into its belief system.

Such proselytizing, according to critics of international/global and "peace" education, has taken place in many American schools and revealed itself in diverse curricular materials. Typically the insertion of politically biased materials has occurred under the banner of "controversy" and the need for its presence in the contemporary classroom. The result has been to raise the issue of "balance," for it is one thing for schools to invite students to discuss some public controversy, quite another for teachers to tell children on which side they should place themselves.

To take one example, the following exercise—widely cited as a useful instructional device on the Third World—is recommended to teachers:

Divide students into two groups: one-fourth of the students move to a large section of the classroom, while three-fourths move to a small section. Distribute 20 candy bars: 16 to the small group and 4 to the large group. Have students divide the candy equally within the group. Ask them to discuss their feelings as they do this and as they watch the other group dividing its share.

The aim of the exercise is not hard to fathom. Students are called on to "discuss their feelings" about a palpably unfair system of distributing candy. Indeed the article tells teachers they can expect students to mutter "This isn't fair; the candy is not shared equally." "Whether I am rich or poor is just a question of luck; it doesn't matter how hard I work." "I feel angry, jealous, sad, helpless." And so on.

The assumption that this exercise serves some educational purpose is found in the final instruction to the teacher:

Write on the board: "One fourth of the world's people have four-fifths of world's goods and services, leaving one-fifth of the goods and services for three-fourths of the world's people." (This statement is based on the relative size of gross national product per capita in rich and poor countries. You may want to explain that in reality goods and services are rarely shared equally *within* a country, so some people in developing countries receive an even smaller share than in this activity.) Ask students what the consequences of this imbalance might be and what people might do to improve the situation.

The stage is set, by the nature of its construction, for an "equal distribution" reform to be demanded by the angry and indignant children. In essence, a simplistic conception of the world is offered the class, with a program to redistribute wealth as the self-evident solution.

Is this "balance"? The vital question of wealth *creation*, and of which social arrangements have proved most productive of high standards of living, is entirely left out of the equation. Goods appear by magic, and are literally "distributed" to the populace by a figure of authority. Moral indignation is elicited through a very partial, and artificial, model of reality. The excluded factor—wealth creation—is a complex process, yet quite within the grasp of students (and teachers) once attention is paid to established principles of economics. To leave economics out of the picture results in a politically biased presentation of the world.

Other examples of imbalance in international education are not difficult to find. (See André Ryerson's chapter on how textbooks have portrayed life in China and presented its history.) At times the bias is at a high level of generality. For

example, one model divides society into two types of person: those who seek to transmit the culture, and those who seek to transform it. The more admirable type of person is the transformer, the revolutionary, while the transmitter or preserver is a mind of less imagination content to defend the status quo. But as critics of the transformer/transmitter model have argued, this is a very artificial distinction, and even among the authors of the American Revolution the pursuit of both continuity and change were intermingled. Moreover, the achievement of America's founders will be lost if future generations through our schools begin to denigrate cultural transmission.

Is balance in the handling of public controversies beyond the reach of educators? Some hold that it is; they argue that equity and fairness are defined differently by each individual, and so amount to an impossible institutional ideal. If this is true, and biased teaching is the inevitable consequence of dealing with controversy, then a strong case exists for removing the discussion of public controversies from our schools.

But we hold otherwise. Countless government institutions manage to deal with a diverse public in an equitable way. Bias is avoided as a matter of policy and is reinforced by laws. There is no reason to believe that the same standards cannot be met by public schools. Perfection will never be attained, but approximate balance and equity is entirely possible and operates in institutions where it is sought.

The central guideline can be stated simply. *In the classroom discussion of public controversies, public schools must take care to equitably present the principal contending views.*

Balance is achieved by making sure that one side of an argument or controversy is not favored over another. The first step, needless to say, is for the teacher to be well-informed on the subject, hence familiar with the arguments by differing advocacy groups. If materials are used, they should be obtained from such advocacy groups, or from newspapers or magazines that have articulated their case. Most of the time this is not difficult, for our country is well-endowed with publications that range the political spectrum. While the mainstream arguments on either side of the issue should have primary place, more radical opinions can be summoned—so long as radicals in one direction are balanced with radicals on the other. The role of the teacher should be that of a referee or umpire, making the class see how fairness in handling opposing viewpoints is an attainable and civilizing process.

Much in our society, beginning with the justice system but certainly not ending there, depends on the ethos of due process, fair rules, and institutional

neutrality. If international education cannot better approach the norms expected of democratic governance, its future as a discipline will remain clouded, for its foundation will be at odds with the values of American citizenship.

We are confident that good sense will eventually prevail in this, as in other debated areas of American public education.

Bibliography

A bibliography reflects the perspective of the person who creates it. For this reason we have preserved three excellent bibliographies in successive "layers," rather than blend them together, so that the student or scholar of global/international education can compare styles and differences while discerning their common ground.

Bibliography A ranges very widely to include critics of the field as well as its many advocates and specialists.

Bibliography B is probably the closest to the frame of reference accepted by most educators in global/international education.

Bibliography C introduces the user to the ERIC system of reference and retrieval.

Finally, there is a short Addendum, in which we list works of value found in none of the three ABC sections.

BIBLIOGRAPHY A: Compiled by Jeffrey A. Gray, The World Without War Council, 1730 Martin Luther King Jr., Way, Berkeley, CA 94709.

BIBLIOGRAPHY B: Compiled by Andrew F. Smith, The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038.

BIBLIOGRAPHY C: From the ERIC system, Social Studies Development Center, 288805 East Tenth Street, Suite 120, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47408. It was compiled by John J. Patrick and C. Frederick Risinger.

ADDENDUM: Compiled by John Fonte.

BIBLIOGRAPHY A

Contents

<i>I. Overview, History or Conceptual Contribution</i>	117
<i>II. Advocacy or Useful Polemic</i>	123
<i>III. Pertaining to Specific Issues</i>	128
<i>IV. Mileposts, Commission Reports or Agendas for Action</i>	127
<i>V. Sample Curricula, Case Studies, Curricular Guides</i>	132
<i>VI. Bibliographies, Organizational Listings</i>	136
<i>VII. Additional Resources</i>	137

Bibliography A

I. Overview, History or Conceptual Contribution¹

1. Academy for Educational Development, Inc., *Helping Americans Learn About the World . . . A Study of Private-Sector Activities*, Academy for Educational Development, Inc.: Washington, DC (1978).
2. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange, *Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange*, Council on International Educational Exchange: New York, NY (1988).
3. Alger, C.F., "Some Problems in Improving International Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).
4. Anderson, L.F., "An Examination of the Structure and Objectives of International Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).
5. Becker, J.M. and East, M.A., *Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The Secondary School*, Center for War/Peace Studies: New York, (1972). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]

¹Some items of particular importance are listed in more than one category. We plan to develop a computerized retrieval system that will allow for searching via author and subject.

6. Bergen, T.J. Jr. and Kelley, L.M., "International Education: Toward the Future," *International Education*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Fall (1985).
7. Bragaw, D.H. and Loew, H.Z, "Social Studies and Language: A Partnership," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. Feb. (1985).
8. Boulding, E., *Building A Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*, Teachers College Press: Hagerstown, MD (1988).
9. Carper, S., "Global What??? or What Kind of Education," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).
10. Cleveland, H., "Educating for the Information Society," *Change*, Jul./Aug. (1985).
11. Cleveland, H., "The World We're Preparing Our Schoolchildren For," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 6, Oct. (1986).
12. Colman, P., "Global Education: Teaching for an Interdependent World," *Media & Methods*, Jan./Feb. (1989).
13. Cortes, C.E. and Fleming, D.B., "Changing Global Perspectives in Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 5, Sept. (1986).
14. Cortes, C.E. and Fleming, D.B., "Introduction: Global Education and Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 5, Sept. (1986).
15. Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), *An American Forum on Education and International Competence*, CIEE: New York, NY, May (1988).
16. Dhand, H., "Recent Research on Global Education," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).
17. East, M.A., "Changes in the Study of International Relations," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 6, Oct. (1986).
18. Eastman, D., "Institutional Principles for International Education," *International Education*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Winter (1987-88).
19. Engle, S.H. and Ochoa, A., "A Curriculum for Democratic Citizenship," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1986).

20. English, R. ed., *Teaching International Politics in High School*, Ethics and Public Policy Center: Washington, DC (1989).
21. Gagnon, P., *Democracy's Half Told Story: What American History Textbooks Should Add*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1989).
22. Gagnon, P., *Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1987).
23. Gagnon, P., "Why Study History?," *The Atlantic*, Nov. (1988).
24. Goodlad, J.I., "The Learner at the World's Center," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 6, Oct. (1986).
25. Groennings, S. and Wiley, D., *Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1990).
26. Hahn, C.L., "The Presidential Address," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Apr. (1984).
27. Hanvey, R.G., *An Attainable Global Perspective*, Center for War/Peace Studies: Denver, CO (1975). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
28. Hepburn, M.A., "What Is Our Youth Thinking," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
29. Hudson Institute, *Transformation in Global Security: A Rational Curriculum for the Study of International Relations*, Hudson Institute: Indianapolis, IN (1986).
30. Kelman, H.C., "Education for the Concept of a Global Society," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No.7, Nov. (1968).
31. King, D., *International Education for Spaceship Earth*, Foreign Policy Association: Washington, DC (1971).
32. Kniep, W.M., *A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities*, Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.: New York, NY (1985). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
33. Kniep, W.M., "Defining a Global Education by Its Content," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 6, Oct. (1986).

34. Kniep, W.M., *Essentials for a Global Education*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1989). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
35. Kniep, W.M. "Global Education in the Eighties," *Curriculum Review*, Nov./Dec. (1985).
36. Kniep, W.M., "Global Education: The Road Ahead," *Social Education*, Vol. , No. , Oct. (1986).
37. Kniep, W.M., "Social Studies Within A Global Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1986).
38. Lamy, S.L. "Defining Global Education," *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1983).
39. Lamy, S.L., *The Definition of a Discipline: The Objects and Methods of Analysis in Global Education*, Social Education Global Perspectives in Education: New York, NY (1987). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
40. Lister, I., "Approaches to Research on Global and International Education in the U.K. and Western Europe," Prepared for: Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, Mar. (1989).
41. Longstreet, W.S., "Education for Citizenship: New Dimensions," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 1, Jan. (1989).
42. Lopach, J.J. and Luckowski, J.A., "The Rediscovery of Memory in Teaching Democratic Values," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 3, Mar. (1989).
43. Magidson, H., *The Relationship Between International Education and American Civic Education*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1989).
44. Mastrude, R.G., "A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Foreign Policy Decisions in the Classroom," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).
45. McClelland, C.A. "Selecting and Processing Information in World Affairs Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).
46. Mehlinger, H.D., "Enlarging the International Component of the High School Social Studies Curriculum," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).

47. Melnick, R., *Visions of the Future: A Textbook on the Past, Present and Future*, Hudson Institute: New York, W (1984).
48. Nakayama, S., "A View From Japan," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 3, Mar. (1989).
49. National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington DC (1989).
50. National Council for the Social Studies Ad Hoc Committee on Global Education, "Global Education: In Bounds or Out?," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 4, Apr./May (1987).
51. National Council for the Social Studies Ad Hoc Committee on Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, "Revision of the NCSS Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," *Social Education*, Vol. 43, No. 4, Apr. (1979).
52. National Council for the Social Studies Citizenship Committee, 1981-1983, "Essential Characteristics of a Citizenship Education Program," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 6, Sept./Oct. (1984).
53. National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Early Childhood/Elementary Social Studies, "Social Studies for Early Childhood and Elementary School Children Preparing for the 21st Century," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 1, Jan. (1989).
54. Nesbitt, W.A., *Social Education: International Education for the Twenty-first Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington, DC (1968).
55. Nesbitt, W.A., *Teaching About Prevention*, Foreign Policy Association: (1971).
56. Nettleford, R., "Education in a Global Age," *ACCESS*, Sept. (1988).
57. O'Neil, J., "Global Education: Controversy Remains, But Support Growing," *Curriculum Update*, Jan. (1989).
58. Reardon, B.A., *Comprehensive Peace Education*, Teachers College Press, Columbia University: New York, NY (1988).

59. Remy, R. et al, *International Learning and International Education in a Global Age*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington, DC (1975).
60. Rhinesmith, S.H., "Americans in the Global Learning Process," *The Annals of the American Academy*, Mar. (1979).
61. Scanlon, D.G., *International Education: A Documentary History*, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, NY (1960).
62. Scrupski, A., "Pedagogic Moral Equivalence," *Academic Questions*, Mar. (1986).
63. Shaver, J.P., "Commitment to Values and the Study of Social Problems in Citizenship Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Mar. (1985).
64. Smith, A.F., *The International Perspective: American Citizenship in an Interdependent World*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1989).
65. Study Commission on Global Education, *The United States Prepares for Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education*, Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.: New York, (1987). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
66. Sussman, L.R., "Valuing and Revaluing America," Speech to the National Conference on Global Crossroads: Educating Americans for Responsible Choices: Washington, DC, May (1984).
67. Tooke, M., "A View From Canada," *Social Science*, Oct. (1988).
68. Tucker, J.L., "Social Studies for the 21st Century," *Social Science*, Mar. (1988).
69. van der Horst, H., "Evaluation Confirms the Value of International Education," *International Education*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Fall (1987).
70. Welds, K., "Psychological Impact of International Education: What Dimensions Of Attitude Change And Personal Growth Are Associated With Cross-Cultural Experiences?" *International Education*, Vol. 16, No. 1, Fall (1986).
71. Woyach, R.B. and Remy, R.C., "Strengthening World Studies: The Challenge of Conceptualization," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1988).

II. Advocacy or Useful Polemic

1. Alleman, J.E., "Social Studies Educators Respond to Mathews," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
2. American Federation of Teachers, *Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1987).
3. Andrews, J.K., "Classrooms for the Free Society," *Independence Issue Paper*, (1988).
4. Andrews, J.K., "When Educating for World Affairs, First Cover Home Base," *Independence Institute Paper*, June (1989).
5. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), "Issue," Vol. 32, No.1, Jan. (1990), p.7.
6. Bell, M.H., "The Strength to Dance," *ACCESS*, No. 81 (1988).
7. Bennett, W.J., *Why the West?*, United States Department of Education: Washington, DC, Apr. (1988).
8. Bergen, T.J. Jr., and Kelley, L.M., *International Education: Toward the Future*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Fall (1985).
9. Berne, R.C. and Judy, J.M., "Linking Global and Local Concerns," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Mar. (1985).
10. Birn, D., "The Role of Peace Movements: A Significant Theme in Nuclear War Education," in Ehrlich, R., *Perspectives on Nuclear War and Peace Education*, Greenwood Press: New York, NY (1987).
11. Brady, M., "In Search of a Social Studies Discipline," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 4, Apr./May (1987).
12. Caporaso, J.A., and Mittelman, J.H., "The Assault on Global Education," *Political Science & Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter (1988).
13. Center for Educational Integrity, *Ed-Advisory*, CEI: Ormond Beach, FL, Aug. (1987).
14. Cherryholmes, C.H., "The Political Project of Tomorrow's Teachers," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1987).

15. Clarke, S., *On the Recent Criticisms of CTIR and Global Education*, University of Denver/CTIR: Denver, CO, Sept. (1986).
16. Cortes, C.E. and Fleming, D.B., "Changing Global Perspectives in Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 5, Sept. (1986).
17. Cortes, C.E. and Fleming, D.B., "Introduction: Global Education and Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 5, Sept. (1986).
18. Cunningham, G.L., *Blowing the Whistle on "Global Education,"* Prepared for: Thomas G. Tancredo, Secretary's Regional Representative, Region VIII, U.S. Dept. of Education: Denver, CO (1986).
19. Engle, S.H. and Ochoa, A., "A Curriculum for Democratic Citizenship," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1986).
20. English, R., "Do Arms Races Cause Wars?," in Ehrlich, R., *Perspectives on Nuclear War and Peace Education*, Greenwood Press: New York, NY (1987).
21. English, R. ed., *Teaching International Politics in High School*, Ethics and Public Policy Center: Washington, DC (1989).
22. Enloe, W. and Cogan, J., "The Hiroshima Experience: Two Reflections," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
23. Fassler, J. and Janis, M.G., "Books, Children, and Peace," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 6, Sept. (1985).
24. Feffer, J., "Peace Studies Comes of Age," *Nuclear Times*, Sept./Oct. (1988).
25. Fersh, S., "Becoming Self-Educating and Culture-Creating by Being Educated Trans-Culturally," *Reflections*, Winter (1982).
26. Finn, C. and Bauer, G., "Globaloney," *The American Spectator*, May (1986).
27. Frey, L. and Frey, M., "The New Sexism and Racism," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).
28. Gregg, D.R.. "Another Viewpoint on Education for Democracy," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1988).

29. Gross, S.H., "Women's History, for Global Learning," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 3, Mar. (1987).
30. Hahn, C.L., "The Presidential Address," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Apr. (1984).
31. Hartoonian, H. M. , "National Consciousness in a Global Community," speech to the Annual Meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium: Utah State University, June (1987).
32. Haynes, C.C., "Religious Literacy in the Social Studies," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1987).
33. Hepburn, M.A., "What Is Our Youth Thinking," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
34. Hexter, J.H., "Doing Western Civ: An Ethnocentric View," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).
35. Independence Institute, "Globalism in the Schools: Education or Indoctrination? The Cunningham Report," *Independence Issue Paper*, June (1986).
36. Kersten, K., *The "Radicalization" of Minnesota's Public School Curriculum: The Case of Central America*, Minnesota Association of Scholars: St. Louis Park, MN Oct. (1988).
37. London, H.I., *Armageddon in the Classroom: An Examination of Nuclear Education*, University Press of America: Lanham, MD (1987).
38. London, H.I., "Peace Studies in the Academy," *Academic Questions*, Vol. 1, No. 3, Summer (1988).
39. Longstreet, W.S., "Education for Citizenship: New Dimensions," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 1, Jan. (1989).
40. Lopach, J.J. and Luckowski, J.A., "The Rediscovery of Memory in Teaching Democratic Values," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 3, Mar. (1989).
41. Martin, D.S., "Ethnocentrism Revisited: Another Look at a Persistent Problem," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 7, Oct. (1985).
42. Massie, D.C., "Censorship and the Question of Balance," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 2, Feb. (1984).

43. Mathews, D., "Civic Intelligence," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
44. McConnell, S. and Breindel, E., "Head to Come," *The New Republic*, Jan. 8 & 15 (1990).
45. Naismith, D., "My Country Right or Wrong?," *Telegraph Sunday Magazine*, Sunday Telegraph: London, UK, (1988).
46. Nettleford, R., "Education in a Global Age," *ACCESS*, Sept. (1988).
47. Newitt, J., "The Pedagogy of Fear and Guilt: How Textbooks Treat the World Economy," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 1, Jan. (1984).
48. Newman, F.M., "Another View of Cultural Literacy: Go for Depth," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 6, Oct. (1988).
49. O'Brien, S., "How to Produce a Better Edsel—Writing U.S. History Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 2, Feb. (1989).
50. Payne, K.B. and Coleman, J., "Nuclear Age Education," *Policy Review*, Fall (1987).
51. Pickus, R., *Doing Something About the International Education, Global Education, Peace Imbroglio*, World Without War Council: Berkeley, CA, Jul. (1986).
52. Pickus, R., "Teaching the Young," *American Purpose*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Apr. (1987).
53. Reardon, B.A., *Comprehensive Peace Education*, Teachers College Press, Columbia University: New York, NY (1988).
54. Robinson, P., "Henry Johnson and the Place of History in Education for World Peace," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 2, Feb. (1985).
55. Roche, D., "Global Education," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).
56. Rosenthal, A.M., "Educating for Freedom," *The New York Times*, May 3, (1987).

57. Ross, E.W., "Educating for Democracy: A Lesson from the Past," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 6, Oct. (1988).
58. Ryerson, A., "Capitalism and Selfishness," *Commentary*, Dec. (1986).
59. Ryerson, A., "The Cult of Hiroshima," *Commentary*, Oct. (1985).
60. Ryerson, A., "The Scandal of 'Peace Education,'" *Commentary*, Jun. (1986).
61. Schwartz, A.E., "Can Citizens Save Chicago's Schools?," *The Washington Post*, Oct. 12, (1989).
62. Scrupski, A., "Pedagogic Moral Equivalence," *Academic Questions*, Mar. (1986).
63. Shanker, A., "An Open Letter To Education Secretary Bennett," *The New York Times*, May 1, (1988).
64. Shanker, A., "Which Way Global Education? Propaganda or Education?," *The New York Times*, Feb. 19, (1989).
65. Shaver, J.P. "Commitment to Values and the Study of Social Problems in Citizenship Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Mar. (1985).
66. Short, T., "Education and Indoctrination," *Academic Questions*, Mar. (1986).
67. Sommers, C.H., "Ethics Without Virtue: Moral Education in America," *The American Scholar*, Vol. 53, No. 3, Summer (1984).
68. Spencer, M. "What Are We Teaching Our Kids?" *Nuclear Times*, Sept./Oct. (1988).
69. Tucker, J.L., "Social Studies for the 21st Century," *Social Science*, Mar. (1988).
70. Unks, G., "Critical Thinking in the Social Studies Classroom: Do We Teach It?," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Mar. (1985).
71. Von Laue, T., "A Global Perspective," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).

72. Woyach, R.B. and Remy, R.C., "Strengthening World Studies: The Challenge of Conceptualization," *Social Education*, Vol. 52, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1988).

III. Pertaining to Specific Issues

1. Brody, R.A., "Why Study Politics?," in National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington, DC (1989).
2. Bukovsky, V., "The Need for Historical Context," *Social Education*, Sept. (1985).
3. Burrell, S., "The Uniqueness of the West," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).
4. Charles, C., "Using the Natural World to Teach and Learn Globally," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Mar. (1985).
5. Education for Democracy Project, *Making History Relevant: Making History Interesting*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington: DC, (1989).
6. Fassler, J. and Janis, M.G., "Books, Children, and Peace," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 6, Sept. (1985).
7. Gagnon, P., *Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1987).
8. Groennings, S., "The Empires of the Mind: The Global Economy and Higher Education's Agenda," *ACCESS*, Oct./Nov. (1988).
9. Groennings, S., *Economic Competitiveness and International Knowledge*, New England Board of Higher Education: Boston, MA (1987).
10. Hahn, C.L., "Human Rights: An Essential Part of the Social Studies Curriculum," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 6, Sept. (1985).
11. Haynes, C.C., "Religious Literacy in the Social Studies," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1987).
12. Hoffman, A.J., "Essential Characteristics of a Citizenship Education Program," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 6, Sept./Oct. (1984).

13. Mathews, D., "Civic Intelligence," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
14. McNeill, W.H., "World Civ as an Alternative," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).
15. McNeill, W.H., "World History," in National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington DC (1989).
16. Minkel, C.W., "International Education: A Special Edition," *International Education*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Spring (1988).
17. O'Brien, S., "How to Produce a Better Edsel—Writing U.S. History Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 2, Feb. (1989).
18. Ravitch, D., "Tot Sociology: Or What Happened to History in the Grade Schools," *The American Scholar*, Summer (1987).
19. Reardon, B.A., *Comprehensive Peace Education*, Teachers College Press, Columbia University: New York, NY (1988).
20. Roche, G., "Doing in Western Civ: The Levellers at Stanford," *Continuity*, No. 12, Fall (1988).
21. Spencer, M., "What Are We Teaching Our Kids?" *Nuclear Times*, Sept./Oct. (1988).
22. Totten, S., "Teaching About International Human Rights," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 6, Sept. (1985).
23. Trberman, T., "Using Microcomputers to Teach Global Studies," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 2, Feb. (1984).

IV. Mileposts, Commission Reports or Agendas for Action

1. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange, *Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange*, Council on International Educational Exchange: New York, NY Aug. (1988).

2. AEGIS, Charter for the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies, Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies: New York, NY Oct. (1987).
3. AEGIS, *A Statement of Balanced, Non-Partisan Education and the Development of Critical-Thinking Skills*, Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies: New York, NY, Oct. (1988).
4. American Federation of Teachers, *Education for Democracy: A Statement of Principles*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1987).
5. Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, *Building a History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in the Schools*, Educational Excellence Network: New York, NY (1988).
6. Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS), *International Competence: A Key to America's Future*, CAFLIS: Washington, DC, DRAFT—NOT FOR DISSEMINATION, Oct. (1989).
7. Goodlad, J.I., "The Learner at the World's Center," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 6, Oct. (1986).
8. Groennings, S., *Economic Competitiveness and International Knowledge*, New England Board of Higher Education: Boston, MA (1987).
9. Hahn, C.L., "The Presidential Address," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Apr. (1984).
10. Hayden, R., *The Perkins Commission, An Update*, National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies: New York, NYU (1980). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
11. Kniep, W.M. "Global Education in the Eighties," *Curriculum Review*, Nov./Dec. (1985).
12. Kniep, W.M., "Social Studies Within A Global Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1986).
13. Lamy, S.L., "Defining Global Education," *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1983).

14. Magidson, H., *The Relationship Between International Education and American Civic Education*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1989).
15. Mathews, D., "Civic Intelligence," *Social Education*, Vol. 40, No.8, Nov./Dec. (1985).
16. Minnesota Department of Education, *Minnesota in the World and the World in Minnesota*, Minnesota Department of Education: St. Paul, MN (1990).
17. National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington, DC (1989).
18. National Council for the Social Studies Ad Hoc Committee on Global Education, "Global Education: In Bounds or Out?" *Social Education*, Vol. 51, No. 4, Apr./May (1987).
19. National Council for the Social Studies Ad hoc Committee on Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, "Revision of the NCSS Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," *Social Education*, Vol. 43, No. 4, Apr. (1979).
20. National Council for the Social Studies Citizenship Committee, 1981-1983, "Essential Characteristics of a Citizenship Education Program," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 6, Sept./Oct. (1984).
21. National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Early Childhood/Elementary, Social Studies, "Social Studies for Early Childhood and Elementary School Children Preparing for the 21st Century," *Social Education*, Vol. 53, No. 1, Jan. (1989).
22. National Governors' Association, "America in Transition: Report of the Task Force on International Education," *ACCESS*, No. 85, Special Issue (1989).
23. National Governors' Association Task Force on International Education, *America in Transition: The International Frontier*, National Governors' Association: Washington, DC (1989).
24. President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (Perkins, J.A.), *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*, Commission on Language and Global Studies: Washington, DC, Oct. (1979).

25. Southern Governors' Association Advisory, Council on International Education, *Cornerstone of Competition*, Southern Governors' Association: Washington, DC (1986).
26. Study Commission on Global Education, *The United States Prepares For Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education*, Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.: New York, NY (1987). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
27. Tucker, J.L., "Teacher Attitudes Toward Global Education: A Report from Dade County," *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol 8., No. 1, Special Edition (1983).
28. United States Department of Education, "Mapping the Common Ground," Remarks of Chester E. Finn, Jr. before the American Forum on Education and International Competence, St. Louis, MO., May (1988).
29. United States Department of Education, *What Works*, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC (1987).
30. Unsicker, J., *Global Peace, Justice & Development Education*, World College West: Petaluma, CA (1986).

V. Sample Curricula, Case Studies, Curricular Guides²

1. ACCESS *The ACCESS Resource Guide*, Ballinger Publishing Co.: Cambridge, MA (1988).
2. American Forum for Global Education, *The New Global Resource Book*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1990).
3. Bahmueller, Chas., (edit), *Civitas*, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, CA (1991), is an extensive curriculum framework on civic and international/global education.
4. Baker, W.J., "Global Education: The Classroom Experience From the Bastille to Beirut," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).

²A listing of specific events, controversies, case histories and resource guides which highlight the problems considered in this project. Also included are selected publishers that produce materials relating to these problems. Many resource guides list organizations and select bibliographies. See also section VI.

5. Bay Area Global Education Program (BAGEP), *World Cultures: A Theme Guide to K-12 Curricular Resources, Activities, and Processes*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1984).
6. Burley, T. and Atkinson, G., "Geographic Skills: A Research-Based Sequence for Grades One to Nine," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).
7. *California History—Social Science Framework K-12*, California State Board of Education, Sacramento, CA (1987).
8. Center for Foreign Policy Development, *America, the Soviets and Nuclear Arms: Looking to the Future*, Brown University: Providence, RI (1989).
9. Central America Resource Center, *Directory of Central America Classroom Resources K-12*, Central America Resource Center: Minneapolis, MN (1987).
10. Davenport, B.A., *Resources in Global Studies PACRIM Packet*, USC-School of International Relations: Los Angeles, CA (1989).
11. Davenport, B.A. and Kearney, C., *Resources in Global Studies NUKPAK*, USC-School of International Relations: Los Angeles, CA (1989).
12. Education for Democracy Project, *Making History Relevant: Making History Interesting*, American Federation of Teachers: Washington: DC (1989).
13. Education for Democracy Project, *Czechoslovakia: A Selection of Teaching Materials*, Draft Copy, American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC (1990).
14. Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR), *Knowing the Nuclear World: A Bibliography of Selected Curricula and Teaching Materials*, ESR: Cambridge, MA (1986).
15. Engle, S.H. and Ochoa, A., "A Curriculum for Democratic Citizenship," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, No. 7, Nov./Dec. (1986).
16. Institute for Peace and Justice, *Educating For Peace and Justice: Teacher Background Readings*, Institute for Peace and Justice: St. Louis, MO (1984).
17. Kersten, K., *The "Radicalization" of Minnesota's Public School Curriculum: The Case of Central America*, Minnesota Association of Scholars: St. Louis Park, MN Oct. (1988).

18. King, D., Branson, M., and Condon, L., *Education for a World of Change: A Working Handbook for Global Perspectives*, Center for Global Perspectives of the New York Friends Group, Inc.: New York, NY (1976). [Now the American Forum for Global Education]
19. Lister, I., "Approaches to Research on Global and International Education in the U.K. and Western Europe," Prepared for: Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, Mar. (1989).
20. McFarland, M.A., "Critical Thinking in Elementary School Social Studies," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, No. 4, Apr. (1985).
21. Mershon Center, *Teaching About National Security*, Addison-Wesley: Menlo Park, CA (1989).
22. Morris, D. and King, E., "Bringing Spaceship Earth into Elementary Classrooms," *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No. 7, Nov. (1968).
23. National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century*, National Council for the Social Studies: Washington DC (1989).
24. National Institute for Public Policy (NIPP), *Peacekeeping in the Nuclear Age*, NIPP: Fairfax, VA (1988).
25. Quigley, C.N., *Your Rights and Responsibilities As An American Citizen*, UCLA-The Civic Education Committee: Los Angeles, CA (1967).
26. Reardon, B., ed., *Educating for Global Responsibility: Teacher Designed Curricula for Peace Education K-12*, Teachers College Press: Hagerstown, MD (1988).
27. Roach, P.B., *Teaching for Global Perspective: A Resource Handbook*, Arkansas Department of Education: Little Rock, AR (1988).
28. Rudin, B., "Teaching Critical Thinking Skills," *Social Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Apr. (1984).
29. Shands, F., *Insight for Peace in a Nuclear Age*, St. Louis University Press: St. Louis, MO (1988).
30. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *The American Schools and the World Project Papers*, Stanford University:

Stanford, CA [A Series of conference and research papers of the American Schools and the World (ASAW) Project]

31. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *The Anatomy of Conflict*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1987).

32. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *China Resources: A Guide for the Classroom*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1986).

33. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Choices in International Conflict*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1988).

34. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Economic Choices: China After Mao*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1988).

35. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *The Evolution of the Methods and Rules of War*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1989).

36. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *The Individual and the State*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1989).

37. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Soviet-American Relations: From the Cold War to New Thinking*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1990).

38. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Teaching About A Changing China*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1986).

39. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *U.S.-Soviet Relations: From the Origins to Recognition*, Stanford University: Stanford, C.3 (1989).

40. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Values in Conflict: Literature on China's Youth*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1988).

41. Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), *Why War?*, Stanford University: Stanford, CA (1988).

42. Tooke, M., "The Global Village in the Classroom," *History and Social Science Teacher*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Winter (1986-87).

43. Tucker, J.L. "Teacher Attitudes Toward Global Education: A Report from Dade County," *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol 8., No. 1, Special Issue (1983).

VI. Bibliographies, Organizational Listings

1. ACCESS, *The ACCESS Resource Guide*, Ballinger Publishing Co.: Cambridge, MA (1988).
2. ACCESS, *Search for Security: The ACCESS Guide to Foundations in Peace, Security, and International Affairs*, ACCESS: Washington, DC (1989).
3. American Forum for Global Education, *The New Global Resource Book*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1990).
4. American Forum for Global Education, *The New Global Yellow Pages*, The American Forum for Global Education: New York, NY (1989).
5. Central America Resource Center, *Directory of Central America Classroom Resources K-12*, Central America Resource Center: Minneapolis, MN (1987).
6. College of Education, University of Minnesota, *An Annotated Bibliography for Elementary and Secondary Teachers*, College of Education, University of Minnesota: Minneapolis, MN (1984).
7. National Governors Association, *International Education: A Resource Guide*, National Governors Association: Washington, DC (1989).
8. World Without War Council (WWWC), *Americans & World Affairs: A Guide to Organizations and Institutions in Northern California*, WWWC: Berkeley, CA (1988).
9. World Without War Council (WWWC), *Assembling the Mosaic: A Guide to Chicago's World Affairs Field*, WWWC: Chicago, IL (1987).
10. World Without War Council (WWWC), *Database of Independent Contacts in the Soviet Union*, WWWC: Seattle, WA (1990).
11. World Without War Council, *Directory of National Organizations Dealing with Central America*, WWWC: Seattle, WA (1987).

12. World Without War Council (WWWC), *Washington's Window on the World: A Directory of Organizations and Institutions in Washington State*, WWWC: Seattle, WA (1982).
13. World Without War Council (WWWC), *Wolnosc i Pokoj: Documents of Poland's "Freedom and Peace" Movement*, WWWC: Seattle, WA (1989).

VII. Additional Resources
(added by the editors)

1. *Security Studies for the 1990s*, edited by Richard Shultz, Roy Godson, and Ted Greenwood, Macmillan, Riverside, NJ, 1993.

Leading scholars and directors of security studies programs provide an in-depth review of major courses, presenting key concepts, methods, suggested course structure, bibliography and model syllabus. A chapter on the teaching of ethics is also included. Ideal for faculty seeking an overview or preparing courses. Although this book is intended primarily for the university curriculum, it is also useful for teachers and scholars interested in secondary school education.

2. The *Foreign Policy Research Institute* has developed five excellent international education curriculum packets (Japan, Middle East, former-Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, problems of ethnicity, 1993) for the institute's Weekend Academy for high school teachers.

Marvin Wachman Fund for International Education
Manager: Alan Luxenberg
Contact: Laura Kent
Foreign Policy Research Institute
3615 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Bibliography B

Contents

<i>I. Reports of Interest to Global Educators</i>	141
<i>II. Curriculum Handbooks and Other General Global Education Materials</i>	144
<i>III. Catalogs, Directories, Bibliographies and Guides</i>	147
<i>IV. Newsletters and Periodicals</i>	149
<i>V. General Materials: International Relations</i>	151

Bibliography B

I. Reports of Interest to Global Educators

1. *America in Transition—The International Frontier.* Report of the Task Force on International Education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, 1989.

Report authored by Governors Thomas Kean (New Jersey), John Waihee (Hawaii) and Rudy Perpich (Minnesota) stresses the importance of international education mainly at the elementary and secondary level. The major rationale offered by the governors is economic; if states do not improve their respective international education programs a state's economic prospects will likely decline. The report's recommendations are the traditional: (1) international education must become part of the basic education of all of our students; (2) more foreign languages; (3) teachers need more about international issues; and (4) teachers need to know of the wealth of supplementary materials available. Still, it's good to have the governors say it again. \$10.95, must be prepaid. Contact: National Governors' Association Publications, 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 250, Washington, DC 20001-1572, (202) 624-7880.

2. Anderson, Lee. *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education.* Bloomington, IN: Social Studies Development Center (SSDC), Indiana University, 1979.

This book attempts to clarify the full meaning of global education. It documents the long-term trend toward the globalization of society and

describes some of the educational changes already occurring in response to this trend. It is divided into three sections and includes an extensive bibliography. 498 pages, \$40.00, No. ED 214834. *Contact:* ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), 3900 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22304, (800) 227-3742.

3. Bennett, William, and Jeane Kirkpatrick. *History, Geography, and Citizenship: The Teacher's Role*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1986.

The two essays in this booklet are derived from addresses given at an Ethics and Public Policy Conference in April 1985. The two authors, in each of their works, offer valuable advice and insight to elementary and secondary school teachers. They both acknowledge a need to learn early about other cultures so that U.S. students may better understand themselves. 20 pages, \$2.00. *Contact:* University Press of America, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham MD 20706, (301) 459-3366.

4. *Beyond Our Borders: States and International Education*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, 1989.

This report summarizes the proceedings of an Invitational Conference sponsored by the National Governors' Association held in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in April 1989. The conference was held to gain visibility for the NGA's Report of the Task Force on International Education. Includes summaries of presentations by Richard Remy, Ron Schukar, Raymond English, Kurt Müller, J. David Edwards, Diane Ravitch and many other luminaries in the global education field. \$8.00. 24 pages. *Contact:* National Governors' Association, 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 250, Washington, DC 20001-1572, (202) 624-7880.

5. *Building A History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History for Schools*. Westlake, OH: Bradley Commission on History in Schools, 1988.

A booklet explores the conditions that contribute to the effective teaching of history in American schools. In addition, it makes recommendations on the curricular role of history and discusses how concerned people may improve the teaching of history as the core of social studies in the schools. 36 pages, \$3.00 per copy, bulk rates upon request. *Contact:* Educational Excellence Network, 1112 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 785-2955.

6. *Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century.* A Report of the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies *et al.*

The Commission was created by a coalition of the National Council for Social Studies, the American Historical Association (AHA) and the Organization of American Historians (OAH), and was funded, in part, by the National Geographic Society Education Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. The report is divided into three parts: (1) the Curriculum; (2) Research and the Recommended Curriculum; and (3) Perspectives of the Social Science Associations. The first section was written by the Curriculum Task Force, composed of such luminaries as William McNeill, Paul Bohannan, Howard Mehlinger, and Christopher Salter. Its recommendations are a conglomeration of traditional interests in furthering the teaching of history and geography and the "new social studies" of the 1960's and 1970's. Recommendations include the creation of a three year sequence beginning in the ninth grade, which would combine the teaching of American History, World History and Geography. The second section of the report focuses upon research and would have been more interesting if citations were offered for the generalizations offered. It was evidently based upon a critical review of the literature by David Jenness. The third section is extremely useful as it offers the perspectives of several key individuals in social science and humanities organizations. The report is worth purchasing simply for this final section. A companion volume, *Making Sense of Social Studies* by David Jenness, will be published by Macmillan. 84 pages, \$7.00 per copy. Contact: National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), 3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016, (202) 966-7840. For further information about the Commission, contact: National Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, 3440 Ordway Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016, (202) 328-3362.

7. *Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange.* New York: The Council on International Educational Exchange, August 1988.

The Advisory Council, composed of Thomas Bartlett, Chancellor, University of Alabama, Richard Lambert, Director, National Foreign Language Center, Adele Simmons, President, Hampshire College, Barbara Burn and others, calls for increased and widespread international education programs at the higher education level, including study abroad programs. 28 pages, free. Contact: Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017, (212) 661-1414.

8. *International Competence: A Key to America's Future.* Washington, DC: Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1989.

The "CAFLIS Plan of Action" makes recommendations with regard to: (1) the federal role; (2) state and local initiatives; and (3) the relationship between business and education. The process to develop the plan has been underway for the past two years. \$3.00. Also available are reports of the Working Groups: "The Federal Government: Leader and Partner," \$3.00; "State and Local Initiatives: Reforming Education for the International Century," \$3.00; "Spanning the Gap: Toward a Better Business and Education Partnership for International Competence," \$10.00. *Contact:* Association of American Universities (AAU), One Dupont Circle, Suite 730, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 466-5030.

9. Lambert, Richard D., et al. *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies.* Washington, DC: Association of American Universities, 1984.

This report is a comprehensive survey of the current status of language and area studies in the United States. It concentrates on the present capacities of U.S. universities for advanced training and research in foreign language and area studies. Recommendations are given for strengthening in the university programs' studies of these topics. Included are a bibliography, tables, and eight appendices. 436 pages, single copies free. *Contact:* Association of American Universities (AAU), One Dupont Circle, Suite 730, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 466-5030.

10. *The United States Prepares for its Future: Global Perspectives in Education.* New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, 1987.

This report by twenty-two distinguished representatives of education, business and government encourages the content of the curriculum in elementary and secondary schools to reflect the role of the United States in a rapidly changing world. The Commission recommends increased study and understanding of global systems, world civilizations and cultures, domestic and foreign policy development, and more. \$10.00 plus \$2.00 shipping and handling. *Contact:* The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

II. Curriculum Handbooks and Other General Global Education Materials

1. Freeman, Robert, ed. *Promising Practices in Global Education: A Handbook with Case Studies*. New York, NY: National Council for Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1986.

This book provides both a rationale for global education and a process for developing task forces to implement international perspectives in the curriculum. Included are case studies of successful projects. Foreword by Rose Hayden. 170 pages, \$12. 50. *Contact*: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

2. Hanvey, Robert. "An Attainable Global Perspective." New York, NY: Global Perspectives in Education, 1976.

This classic concept paper still holds up. Five "global perspectives" are offered. Worth reading. 28 pages, \$2.00. *Contact*: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

3. Keehn, Dorka, ed. *Global, International and Foreign Language Education: 1988-89 State Profiles*. New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, 1989.

This is a preliminary report of the status of global education in all fifty states. 32 pages, \$4.00. *Contact*: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

4. Kniep, Willard. *A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities*. New York, NY: Global Perspectives in Education, 1985.

This publication, which is part of a series of Occasional Papers, is a study of the literature of global education and is intended to provide a critical review of the field. It offers recommendations that may help to confirm education with a global perspective for all American citizens. 44 pages, \$4.00. *Contact*: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

5. Kniep, Willard M., ed. *Next Steps in Global Education: A Handbook for Curriculum Development*. New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, 1987.

Developed in response to the Studies Commission Report, *The United States Prepares For Its Future*, this handbook is a step in implementing many of the report's recommendations. In four inclusive sections, *Next Steps* is a volume of resources for thinking about the issues and decisions to be faced in curriculum development for the 21st century, and a partnership framework that enables all educational stakeholders to participate in developing an overarching curriculum plan with a global perspective. Each section features articles by some of the leading thinkers and practitioners in education, drawing on their personal experiences as well as past and current research about organizational change and school improvement. The handbook is developed for educators who are ready to make global education a central focus of school curricula and programs. It is designed to be used in a variety of settings and tasks: individual teachers, grade level teams, or subject area faculty developing their own classroom courses as well as by administrators and members of curriculum committees engaged in district-wide curriculum and program development. 220 pages, \$30.00. Contact: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

6. Remy, Richard, ed. "Global Education: A Special Issue of Theory into Practice." Columbus, OH: *Theory into Practice*, 1982.

Covers the need for, and the role of, global perspectives in teacher education. Model training programs are examined in several articles by Lee Anderson, James Becker, Robert Hanvey, Steve Lamy, Judith Torney-Purta, Jan Tucker and Angene Wilson. Single copies, \$4.50. Contact: *Theory into Practice*, 149 Arps Hall, 1945 North High Street, Columbus, OH 43210-1120.

7. Rosengren, Frank H., Marylee Crofts Wiley, and David S. Wiley. *Internationalizing Your School: a Resource Guide for Teachers, Administrators, Parents, and School Board Members*. New York, NY: The National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies, 1983.

A product of the Task Force on Elementary, Secondary, and Undergraduate Education, this book presents model programs, K-12, and indicates how various groups can improve American students' competence in world affairs. 63 pages, \$10.00. Contact: The American Forum for Global

Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

8. Torney-Purta, Judith, ed. *Evaluating Global Education: Sample Instruments for Assessing Programs, Materials and Learning*. New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, 1987.

Compilation of evaluation instruments used in assessing global education programs. Resource bibliography included, and an introduction by Judith Torney-Purta. \$50.00. Contact: The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

9. Woyach, Robert B. *World Regions: The Local Connection*. Columbus, OH: The Mershon Center, Ohio State University, 1982.

These 53 lessons and activities help junior and senior high school students learn about their links to key world regions: Africa, East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. The meaning and dynamic nature of culture and the similarities as well as the differences among the world's cultures are examined. 447 pages, \$7.50. Contact: Columbus Council on World Affairs, The International Center, 57 Jefferson Avenue, Columbus, OH 43215, (614) 461-0632.

III. Catalogs, Directories, Bibliographies and Guides

1. *Global Education-1990 Catalog*. Culver City, CA: Social Studies School Service, 1990.

Describes, with prices and full ordering information, educational materials for schools in all media. Topics include global education, international relations, U.S. foreign policy, U.S. history, global issues, comparative political systems, religions, futures, development and area studies. 62 pages, free. Contact: Social Studies School Service (SSSS), 10200 Jefferson Blvd. Rm B611, P.O. Box 802, Culver City, CA 90232-0802, (800) 421-4246.

2. *The Global Classroom: An Annotated Bibliography for Elementary and Secondary Teachers*. Volume 1. Minneapolis, MN: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1984.

This is a general reference bibliography for teachers and other interested persons who wish quick and effective access to resources that meet the

growing interest in global education. It is the result of a search through more than 44,000 books, articles, and papers. Divided into four sections, it concentrates on books and articles that are a basis for analyzing the development of the global education field, a materials list of instructional resources for specific subject areas and class levels, a source list of organizations, associations and other agencies providing globally-concerned resources, and a materials section of research works in the field. Supported by a grant from the Longview Foundation. 32 pages, \$4.50. *Contact:* Global Education Center, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, University of Minnesota, 105 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612) 626-0555.

3. *The New Global Yellow Pages.* New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education, revised 1989.

Includes descriptions of over 172 global educational organizations, projects and programs. Includes addresses, telephone numbers, and brief descriptions of programs offered by these organizations or projects. \$30.00. *Contact:* The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

4. *Strengthening International Studies in Schools: A Directory of Organizations.* Bloomington, IN: Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, 1988.

Provides an updated and divided annotated list of selected organizations offering materials and services especially designed to aid elementary and secondary school educators in their efforts to strengthen international studies within the school system. Lists contact person and address of World Affairs Councils, professional education associations, international organizations, student and teacher exchange programs, and organizations with special interests. Also identifies national resource centers for area and international studies. Special section of appendices aids in assessing current programs, selecting goals, identifying global links in the home and community, and evaluating a global education program. \$5.00 for the two part series postpaid. *Contact:* Social Studies Development Center, 2805 East Tenth Street, Bloomington, IN 47405, (812) 855-3838.

5. Rentel, Kathryn and Antoinette Errante. Compilers. *The Global Classroom: An Annotated Bibliography for Elementary and Secondary Teachers.* Volume 2. Minneapolis, MN: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1989.

The second volume of *The Global Classroom* (see above) represents a concerted effort to follow up on the original bibliography published in 1983 with the support of the Longview Foundation by the Global Education Center at the University of Minnesota. The first section, titled "In General," is a compilation of books and articles that discuss, define, review or provide rationales for global education and the interdisciplinary topics under its mantle. "Doing Global Education" identifies instructional materials or resources which teachers can use in their classrooms. The third section, "Organizations, etc.," lists selected organizations involved in aspects of global education or international education; many are those that publish the materials listed in the first three sections of the bibliographies. For those entries that do not have a corresponding organization listed, the ERIC catalog number has been included. \$5.50. *Contact:* The Global Education Center, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, The University of Minnesota, 105 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612) 626-0555.

IV. Newsletters and Periodicals

1. *ACCESS*, (newsletter). New York, NY: The American Forum for Global Education.

Published eight times per year (some are double issues), this is a cooperative newsletter of The American Forum, the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies, and the International Exchange Association. It publishes news articles and cites resources for use by global and international studies educators. Its calendar section cites conferences, workshops, summer and travel programs focused entirely upon global education. Issues vary from 12 pages to 24 pages. Subscription, \$25.00 per year. *Contact:* The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038, (212) 732-8606, FAX (212) 791-4132.

2. *Education for a Global Perspective*, (newsletter). Toronto, ON: Ontario Teachers' Federation.

This is the newsletter of "Education for a Global Perspective" project, which is an initiative of the OTF and the Canadian International Development Agency to promote the concepts of global education and global literacy within the Ontario school system. The first issue (December, 1989) includes information about activities in Ontario concerned with developing a global perspective and brief descriptions of educational resources. *Contact:* Tom Lyons, Coordinator, Education for a Global Perspective,

Ontario Teachers' Federation, 1260 Bay Street, Toronto, ON, Canada M5R 2B5, (416) 966-3424.

3. *Global Pages*, (newsletter). Los Angeles, CA: Immaculate Heart College Center.

Issues include interviews, articles, teaching activities, and listing of resources related to topics of interest to global educators. Nine pages, subscriptions are \$10 for 4 issues. *Contact*: Global Pages, Immaculate Heart College Center, 10951 W. Pico Boulevard, Suite 2021, Los Angeles, CA 90064, (213) 470-2293.

4. *Headline Series*. New York, NY: Foreign Policy Association.

Clearly and concisely written by experts on the subject or topics covered. Includes maps, charts, graphs and illustrations. Excellent resource for libraries, teachers and advanced high school students. Four issues published per year. 64-72 pages, individual copies, \$4.00, subscription \$15 per year, \$25 for two years. *Contact*: Foreign Policy Association, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019, (212) 764-4050, FAX (212) 302-6123.

5. *Social Education*, (journal). Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies.

Published eight times per year, this journal of the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), regularly carries articles and resource materials of interest to international studies educators. NCSS also publishes the *Social Studies Professional*, which is a newsletter. It includes information about projects, materials and conferences of general interest to global educators. Membership to NCSS (\$35.00) covers subscription to both publications. *Social Education* subscriptions without membership can be purchased for \$25. Single copies of back issues can be ordered at \$7 each. *Contact*: National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), 3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016, (202) 966-7840.

6. *The Social Studies*, (journal). Washington, DC: Heldref Publications.

Bi-monthly magazine for social studies teachers. Frequently contains topics related to global education. Issues often include activities for students as well as articles and resources on specific topics. 48 pages, \$6.50 per copy, subscription \$39 per year. *Contact*: *The Social Studies*, Heldref Publica-

tions, 4000 Albemarle Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016, (202) 362-6445.

7. *World Eagle*, (periodical). Wellesley, MA: World Eagle.

Published monthly (except July and August), it includes extensive maps, charts, graphs on topics such as population, food, the developing world, trade, etc. Teachers are encouraged to copy and reproduce materials appearing in *World Eagle* for classroom or building use. Useful in world history, area studies and other social studies classes. Subscription, \$36.95 per year, \$70.95 for two years. *Contact:* World Eagle, 64 Washburn Avenue, Wellesley, MA 02181, (800) 634-3805, (Massachusetts residents, call (617) 235-1415), FAX (617) 237-2797.

8. *World News Digest*. Denver, CO: World News Digest.

This is an excellent reference for school libraries. Provides overview and current news on 130 countries. Country profiles are updated quarterly. Includes geography, history, economics, population statistics, quality of life and background on the government. \$99.00 per year for quarterly softbound editions, or \$128.95 per year for quarterly looseleaf editions. A teaching guide, *Activities Using the World News Digest*, is also available from CTIR. \$5.00. *Contact:* World News Digest, or available through the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (303) 871-2164, FAX (303) 871-4000.

9. *World Press Review*, (magazine). New York, NY.

Monthly magazine, published as a nonprofit educational service by The Stanley Foundation. Includes articles from foreign newspapers and magazines about current events topics during the month. No library should be without a subscription to this publication. Subscriptions: \$24.97 one year, \$44.97 two years. *Contact:* *World Press Review*, Office of Publication, 200 Madison Avenue, N.Y. 10016, (212) 889-5155. Subscription information: *World Press Review*, Box 1997, Marion, OH 43305, (800) 669-1002.

V. General Materials: International Relations

The materials listed below are exemplary only, and reflect only a few of the thousands of curriculum units, supplemental resources and teaching aids available for teachers and curriculum coordinators.

1. English, Raymond, ed. *Teaching International Politics in High School*. Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1989.

Series of papers written by William Bennett, Maurice East, John Roche, James Harf, Keith Payne and others, on topics related to the teaching of "international politics," as distinct from "global education," in secondary school. Papers were delivered initially at a conference sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center. Many papers, but not all, approach the topic from a neo-conservative point of view. 161 pages. *Contact*: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1030 Fifteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 682-1200.

2. *Flashpoints*, (series 1 and 2). Rourke, 1986-8.

Two series about issues related to area studies since World War II. Books include illustrations. Series 1 includes following titles: *The Arab-Israeli Issue*, by Paul Harper; *The Cuban Missile Crisis*, by John Griffiths; *The Hungarian Uprising*, by Alan Blackwood; *The Irish Question*, by James Hewitt; *The Rise of Solidarity*, by Tim Sharman; *The Suez Crisis*, by Paul Harper; *The Vietnam War*, by Richard Edwards. Series 2 includes the following titles: *Conflict in Afghanistan*; *Crisis in Central America*; *Crisis in South Africa*; *Division of Berlin*; *Korean War*; *Revolution in Iran*. For grades 7-12. Each book, 77 pages. \$11.95 (hard). *Contact*: Acquire through Rourke, or through Social Studies School Services (SSSS), 10200 Jefferson Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232-0802, (800) 421-4246.

3. *Opposing Viewpoints*, (series). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

The Foreign Policy Series includes 31 student booklets focused on six major areas: Nuclear War; War and Human Nature; Terrorism; The Vietnam War; The Superpowers: A New Detente, which includes topics such as *Is the Cold War Over?*; *Is Soviet-American Economic Cooperation Possible?*; *Is Peace Possible?* The American Foreign Policy component includes titles *What Should be the Goals of U.S. Foreign Policy?*; *What Role Should U.S. Foreign Aid Play in Foreign Policy?* *How Should the U.S. Support its Allies?* *How Should the U.S. Deal with the USSR?* Also *Opposing Viewpoints* has an additional series on Latin America and U.S. Foreign Policy. Booklets present balanced debate on a specific topic; includes reading skills, critical thinking skills, and bibliographies. Each booklet costs \$2.95, Teacher's Guide to Opposing Viewpoints, \$4.95. *Contact*: Greenhaven Press, Inc., P.O. Box 289009, San Diego, CA 92128-9009, (619) 485-7424, (800) 231-5163, FAX (619) 485-9549.

4. *Taking Sides*, (series). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group, 1984.

This 15 volume series is dated, but still useful as a resource for secondary global education teachers and libraries. Most volumes include a bibliography, maps, graphs, tables and illustrations. It has broad coverage of many global issues and topics. Also available are instructors' manuals and testing suggestions. *Contact:* Dushkin Publishing Group, Sluice Dock, Guilford, CT 06437, (800) 243-6532.

5. Hursh, Heidi, and Michael Prevedel. *Activities Using The New State of the World Atlas*. Denver, CO: Center for Teaching International Relations, 1988.

Contains a selection of teaching activities designed to be used with *The New State of The World Atlas*. All activities involve the use of more than one map and are structured to reinforce higher level cognitive skills. Loose-leaf bound, with reproducible student handout and exercise sheets. For grades 7-12. \$29.95. *Contact:* Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (303) 871-2164, FAX (303) 871-4000.

6. *International Relations: Understanding the Behavior of Nations*. Arlington, VA: Close-Up Foundation, 1987.

This multi-media learning package teaches students about the factors and interests that influence foreign policy-makers around the world. Beginning with elements affecting national behavior—national interests, geo-politics, power, economics—the 77-page student book explores the position of the U.S. in the world community and examines how the U.S. has become a leading player in world events. In addressing how U.S. foreign policy is determined, the book describes the governmental decision-making process, as well as how it is affected by such factors as the media and public opinion in the U.S. and elsewhere. Supplementing the student book is a video covering "The Pursuit of National Interests," "Competing Actors in Foreign Policy," "The East-West Split," and "The Concept of Interdependence." For grades 7-12. The classroom set package includes 25 student books, a Teacher's Guide, the video in Beta, VHS or 3/4" format, a video program guide and 8 video teaching activities—\$240.00. Student books and Teachers Guides can be sold individually for \$8.00 each, and the video and associated teaching materials may be ordered separately for \$90.00. *Contact:* Close-Up Foundation, Educational Media, Department C391, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, (800) 336-5479.

7. Kenworthy, Leonard S. *Catching Up With a Changing World: A Primer on World Affairs*. Kennett Square, PA: World Affairs Materials, 1987.

This book is an introduction to ten global issues, including population, environment, the urban revolution, and conflicting ideologies. It contains tables and illustrations. For grades 9-12. 113 pages. \$6.95. *Contact:* World Affairs Materials, Box 726, Kennett Square, PA 19348, (215) 388-2148.

8. *Social Issues Resources Series*. Boca Raton, FL: Social Issues Resource Series, Inc., 1973-88.

Series includes 32 titles in loose-leaf volumes, which contain reprinted articles representing a wide spectrum of opinion and complexity. Annual supplements contain about 20 articles and reflect new developments and changes in an issue. Ideal for libraries or resources for classrooms. Titles include: *Pollution, Population, Food, Human Rights, Technology, The Third World, Defense, Communications and Energy*. *Contact:* Social Issues Resource Series, Inc., P.O. Box 2348, Boca Raton, FL 33427-2348, (407) 994-0079, (800) 232-SIRS, FAX (407) 994-4704.

9. Soley, Mary E., Jacquelyn Johnson and Barbara Miller. *Teacher's Resource Guide*. New York, NY: Foreign Policy Association, 1987.

Seventeen lessons on current U.S. foreign policy issues for secondary social studies teachers. Useful in U.S. history, U.S. government, economics and current events classes. Includes 50 reproducible student handouts, comprehensive resource lists. Over 400 pages. \$19.95. *Contact:* Foreign Policy Association, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019, (212) 764-4050, FAX (212) 302-6123.

10. Switzer, Kenneth, Paul Mulloy, Karen Smith. *Global Issues: Activities and Resources for the High School Teacher*, 2nd edition. Denver, CO: Center for Teaching International Relations, 1987.

Contains background material and activities on global awareness, economic development, human rights, the environment, technology, and international conflict. Sample activities include "It's a Shrinking World," "Solving Environmental Problems," and "Human Rights at Home and Abroad." Resource lists and bibliographies included. Perfect bound with reproducible handout and exercise sheets. For grades 9-12. Price \$24.95 plus eight percent shipping. *Contact:* Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (303) 871-2164, FAX (303) 871-4000.

11. *World Issues Series*. Rourke, 1987.

Series includes books on ten global topics. Titles include: *Food or Famine?* (1987); *Nuclear Weapons* (1987); *Population Growth* (1987); *The Energy Crisis* (1987); *The Arms Trade* (1988); *Endangered Wildlife* (1988); *The Environment* (1988); *The International Drug Trade* (1988); *International Terrorism* (1988); and *World Health* (1988). Includes illustration, photos, maps and diagrams. For students 5-12. 48 pages. \$11.95 (hardback). Contact: Available through Social Studies School Service (SSSS), 10200 Jefferson Blvd, Culver City, CA 90232-0802, (800) 421-4246.

Bibliography C

Documents drawn from the ERIC Search on international and global education, listed here alphabetically by author.

Materials preceded by an ED number are known as ERIC documents and are annotated monthly in *RIE (Resources in Education)*, available in many libraries throughout the country. Documents may be purchased from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), 7420 Fullerton Road, Suite 110, Springfield, VA 22153-2852, in either microfiche (MF) or paper copy (PC). Check, money order, Master Card, and Visa are all accepted. EDRS also provides a toll-free number (800-443-3742) for customer service and phone orders.

Entries preceded by an EJ number are journal articles that are annotated monthly in *CIJE (Current Index to Journals in Education)*, available in many libraries. EJ articles are not available through EDRS; however, they can be located in the journal section of most libraries by using the bibliographic information provided in each annotation.

Additional resources on teaching STS, as well as other social studies topics, can be found by searching the monthly *RIE* index, located in many libraries throughout the country. These libraries also may have complete microfiche collections of ERIC documents available for viewing.

AN: ED289805

AU: Arakapadavil, George

TI: Introducing Multicultural/Global Education into the Schools.

PY: 1985

NT: 15 p.; Paper presented at the National Multicultural Conference (5th, Oshkosh, WI, October 24-25, 1985). PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

AB: Global education lacks a content base due to differing educational approaches. Combining the expected outcomes of liberal education, consisting of the development of effective thinking, effective communication, and value judgments, with the added dimension of the interconnectedness and complexity of the contemporary world can provide a framework for a consistent and comprehensive program. The elements that must be considered in introducing global education into the curriculum are: (1) the level of the learner; (2) the appropriate method of introducing global education into the curriculum; (3) the available resources; and (4) the role of the teacher. Studies reveal that children at the age of nine or ten are most receptive to the introduction of other cultures and peoples. The most appropriate method of introducing global education into the curriculum is to present a global perspective through every course of study. Many resources have been developed for teaching global education, but they must be used selectively. Teacher education courses need to be internationalized in order to prepare instructors for global teaching. To make education relevant to the context of the contemporary world, global perspectives should permeate all levels of learning. Lists of available audio-visual and printed media and selected resource service centers are attached. (SM)

AN: EJ288911

TI: Associated Schools Embark on an Interregional Project on the Study of Contemporary World Problems. PY: 1982

JN: International-Understanding-at-School; n43 p3-11 1982

AV: UMI

AB: UNESCO's Associated Schools Project developed an interregional project for secondary school students in Asia, Europe, and Latin America to study disarmament, the new international economic order, and human rights. The reasons for studying contemporary problems and choosing these issues, the stages of the project, and its evaluation are discussed. (IS)

AN: EJ365371

AU: Avery, Patricia; Blankenship, Glen

TI: Constitutions: Helping Students Develop an International Perspective. PY: 1988

JN: Social-Education; v52 n2 p136,139-40 Feb 1988

AV: UMI

AB: Presents a lesson plan which analyzes and discusses the U.S. Constitution in relation to the constitutions of other countries. States that this international approach offers a deeper understanding of the document and promotes a greater appreciation of it as students examine the values that underlie their rights and responsibilities. (GEA)

AN: ED293783

AU: Beaulieu, Jill; And others

TI: What Is Culture: An Activity-Oriented Teaching Unit.

PY :1987

NT: 27 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO2 Plus Postage.

AB: This paper presents a unit which defines the term "culture" and is to be used to introduce the ninth grade global education program in New Brunswick (Canada) schools or a similar global education curriculum. The working definition of the term culture is the way of life of a people, including all the manifestations of an identifiable human population's practical, creative, and reflective thought, as revealed through their technology, their arts, and their institutions such as government and religion. The unit's methodology encourages active student involvement in the learning process and group interaction. Each lesson plan includes topic, purpose, behaviorable objectives, materials, methods, homework, and evaluation suggestions. Six lessons examine culture through: (1) artifacts from different cultures; (2) varieties of foods and eating habits in different cultures; (3) music and art; (4) women's roles in different cultures; and (5) a review of religion and mythology. The concluding section summarizes the previous study to help students formulate a definition of culture. A method for evaluating group work is presented. (SM)

AN: ED292728

AU: Becker, James

TI: Global Resources: Teaching about Global Education.

CS: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, Bloomington, IN. PY: 1987

AV: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 120, Smith Research Center, Bloomington, IN 47405. NT: 29 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO2 Plus Postage.

AB: This resource packet was designed to help the classroom teacher with teaching about global education. The packet encompasses resources from professional organizations, documents from the Educational Resources

Information Center's (ERIC) Resources in Education (RIE), journal articles from ERIC's Current Index of Journals in Education (CIJE), commercial materials, and audiovisual materials. Professional organizations involved in the enterprise of global education are listed, along with programs and projects they have sponsored and their addresses. A comprehensive listing of documents that have been entered into the ERIC system is presented, accompanied by each document's abstract and ordering information. Documents range from information on developing a global perspective in the social studies program to global education activities. Articles from CIJE are listed, along with their annotations and ordering information. Available commercial materials are summarized, accompanied by the publisher name, address, and price. Audiovisual materials, appropriate to the study of global education, are featured along with their publishers and addresses. (SM)

AN: ED290669

AU: Chapman, John M., Ed.; Dewsbury White, Kathryn, Ed.

TI: Social Studies Education in Michigan (1987-88): Challenges, Trends, Programs and Practices. CS: Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.

PY: 1987

AV: KVISD-REMC12, 1819 E. Michigan Road, Kalamazoo, MI 49002 (\$4.00).

NT: 124 p.; For the 1971 report on Michigan social studies, see ED 051 067. PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

AB: This document consists of a compilation of articles describing innovative programs and trends in social studies programs throughout Michigan. The introductory article gives the results of a survey of the 1971 innovative programs. The first six articles provide guidelines for undertaking innovative approaches in the classroom and overcoming obstacles to implementing new programs. Twelve articles give synopses of new programs in action in various schools throughout the state. New programs include global approaches to education, a law-related course, and an innovative economics course. The recurrent themes identified in these articles are: (1) learning occurs best by "doing;" (2) higher level thinking skills must have a large role in the classroom; (3) the cognitive developmental stage of the student must be considered; (4) a pragmatic approach to curriculum development and implementation should be emphasized; and (5) students' understanding of their interdependence with other people of the world is important. The document concludes with: (1) a philosophy and rationale for social studies education in Michigan; (2) some pointers on constructing a K-12 social studies program; (3) an outline of suggested range and instructional focus for a K-12 social studies program; and (4) a seven step curriculum development model. (SM)

AN: EJ394339
AU: Charlton, Suzanne
TI: Who Shot Marshall Law?
PY: 1989
JN: Social-Studies-Review; v28 n3 pll-17 Spr 1989
AV: UMI

AB: Suggests the use of cooperative learning in social studies as a way of giving meaning to current international events. Lists six benefits researchers attribute to cooperative learning. Outlines a cooperative learning activity designed to introduce students to the media and its impact on their perception of the world. (KO)

AN: EJ357405
AU: Cogan, John J.
TI: Dateline: Expanding our Horizons on Global Issues.
PY: 1987
JN: Social-Education; v51 n5 p326 Sep 1987
AV: UMI

AB: Examines the global connections of the farm crisis in the United States. Urges social studies educators to contribute to a broader international perspective on our domestic problems and calls for contributions to SOCIAL EDUCATION from social studies educators outside the United States. (JDH)

AN: ED290659
AU: Dane, Ernest B.
TI: National Security in the Nuclear Age: Public Library Proposal and Booklist. May 1987 Update. PY: 1987
NT: 16 p.; Supersedes ED 261 923.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

AB: To increase public understanding of national security issues, this document proposes that a balanced and up-to-date collection of books and other materials on national security in the nuclear age be included in all U.S. public libraries. The proposal suggests that the books be grouped together on an identified shelf. Selection criteria for the booklist, cost per library to compile this collection, and applicability to college and secondary school libraries are also discussed. The second section of the proposal contains a booklist of over 68 national security/nuclear age books divided into the following categories: (1) short books for quick grasp of the issues; (2) primary books for broadest understanding; (3) reaching for

solutions; (4) strategic, historical, and arms control analysis; (5) readings from prestigious journals; (6) nuclear war: control and planning; (7) the strategic defense initiative (Star Wars); (8) defense reform and defense budget questions; (9) medical, psychological, and environmental assessments; (10) ethical and moral perspectives; and (11) nuclear weapons data, annual publications, and nuclear proliferation. Eighteen of the references on the booklist appear in Appendix L, "References on Strategic Nuclear Policy" of the Congressional study, "Strategic Defenses: Ballistic Missile Defense Technologies." Each of the books is annotated and listed in the third section of the document. (SM)

AN: EJ353114

AU: Davison, Betsy

TI: SCAN: Setting Up a National Database in Global/International Education. PY: 1987

JN: Social-Studies; v78 n1 p42-43 Jan-Feb 1987

AV: LTMI

AB: Describes a new national electronic database to help social studies teachers locate up-to-date materials in global/international education. Called SCAN (System for Communication and Networking), the database was developed by Global Perspectives in Education. (RKM)

AN: ED294784

AU: Egan, Sarah M., Ed.; Gorham, Amy L., Ed.

TI: Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Resources from the Field. CS: Global Perspectives in Education, Inc., New York, N.Y. PY: 1987

NT: 195 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.

AB: This bibliography contains 400 annotated citations of selected international studies materials produced by U.S. higher educational institutions. The materials are useful for secondary or college level courses, and the document is divided into subject related sections that include annotations of materials about: (1) business education; (2) economics; (3) education; (4) global issues; (5) humanities; (6) political science; (7) science and technology; (8) social sciences; and (9) foreign languages. Ordering information, document prices, and service charges are included. Most of the sections contain an author-title index, and a cumulative subject index is provided. (JHP)

AN: ED274578

AU: Fowler, Robert H.

TI: The Influence of Secondary Teachers' Pedagogical Ideology on the Teaching of Global Issues: A Phenomenological Study. PY: 1985 NT: 86 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, May 28-31, 1985). PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO4 Plus Postage.

AB: The study provides a descriptive-analytic synopsis of the pedagogical ideology of three groups of Canadian teachers as it applies to the teaching of global issues and their beliefs as to the chief influences on the development of their own ideological stances. The population for the study included 36 teachers from five districts in Ontario (divided into two categories, Metro and nonMetro) and one district in Saskatchewan (Metro only) who volunteered to participate. The research was founded on two assumptions: (1) human behavior is significantly influenced by the context in which it occurs; and (2) one cannot understand human behavior without understanding the framework within which the individuals under study interpret their environment. Specifically, the study examined respondents' beliefs about the degree to which they enjoyed curricular autonomy, their beliefs about reasons for choices in selection and depth of treatment of content and teaching methodologies, and beliefs about the significant influences on their ideological stance. The picture that emerged from the data revealed a maturing, non-mobile group who enjoyed and were comfortable with a considerable degree of curricular autonomy. Their ideologies reflected in a general way their own provincial and local contexts, their travel and education, and above all their professional experience. However, each respondent's idiosyncrasies also affected approaches to teaching, and it was considered too difficult to probe deeply into this dimension. Twenty- two tables are included. (TRS)

AN: ED295876

AU: Frazier, Louise; And Others

TI: Social Studies: Elementary School Guide for Teaching about Human Rights.

CS: Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Curriculum Development Services. PY: 1981

NT: 127 p.; For related documents, see SO 019 082-084.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO6 Plus Postage.

AB: Human rights are those essentials of human existence that are inherent in the species. They are moral claims that satisfy the basic needs of all human beings. Ten major goals and numerous objectives were developed to undergird the Detroit (Michigan) curriculum, and this guide is established around the ten major goals for teaching students about human rights with activities and resources appropriate for elementary students. Each of

the 38 lessons is structured around one of the major goals and provides objectives, learner outcomes, activities, and resources. The ten goals help develop understandings that: (1) all people are interdependent; (2) all ethnic groups are unique-and worthwhile; (3) the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the Rights of the Child are a goal for world peace and cooperation; (4) governments at national, state, and local levels affect one's human rights; (5) self-esteem in individuals is enhanced through the knowledge of human rights; (6) all people must be treated with dignity and respect; (7) apathy and indifference foster inhuman conditions; (8) racism, sexism, and genocide have been the results of political and economic structures of particular societies; (9) people have historically attempted to make their world a better place in which to live; and (10) myths and stereotypes about different people should be eliminated. (SM)

AN: ED307193

AU: Garcia, F. Chris

TI: Global Political Concepts In and Out of the "Global Village": Comments on "A Future for Civic Education." PY: 1988 NT: 14 p. ; Paper presented at the National Conference on the Future of Civic Education (Washington, DC, Oct 5-7, 1988). For related documents, see ED 302 474, SO 019 886-887, and SO 019 895-898. PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PCOI Plus Postage.

AB: Using the news media as resource material in the classroom is an excellent and under-utilized way to bring the reality and diversity of external politics into the classroom. Using that external reality in combination with the internal reality of the schools as unique political communities can provide a more complete and realistic civic education. The development of civic competency in student-citizens requires not only an abstract comprehension of political systems, but also the generation of applied political and media skills. One major emphasis of citizenship education concerns the interdependence of peoples and political entities throughout the world. Television in particular brings the concept of a global village into the classroom and should be used to heighten students' interest in and awareness of civic education. Other major themes of civic education concern the use of the news media as an instructional tool for political systems education, the ubiquitous nature of politics in public affairs reporting, and the importance of teaching competency in coping with bureaucratic systems. (PPB)

AN: EJ391387

AU: Hamilton, John Maxwell; Roberts, Lesley

TI: Global Interdependence—Knocking the World We Know Off Its Axis. PY: 1989

JN: Social-Education; v53 n4 p222-23 Apr-May 1989

AV: UMI

AB: Discusses the need for teaching about global interdependence. Points out that nearly every dimension of life in the United States shows proliferating connections to other nations. Describes techniques for finding global links and appreciating their importance. Notes that information emanating from the school will increase general knowledge concerning global interdependence. (KO)

AN: ED289809

AU: Hicks, David W.

TI: Studying Peace: The Educational Rationale. Occasional Paper No. 4. Revised Edition. CS: Saint Martin's Coll., Lancaster (England). Centre for Peace Studies.

PY: 1986

AV: Information Officer, Centre for Peace Studies, St. Martin's College, Lancaster LA1 3JD, England. NT: 37 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO2 Plus Postage.

AB: This paper seeks to clarify the current debate about studying peace in schools and classroom by exploring: (1) the breadth of concern encompassed by peace education; (2) the educational legitimization for studying peace and conflict in the classroom, and (3) curriculum implications of peace education. The problems of peace encompass violence and war, inequality, injustice, environmental damage, and alienation. At its 18th session held in Paris (1974), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization General Conference issued its "Recommendations Concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace." These recommendations listed the following major problems of humankind that students should study: (1) the equality of rights; (2) the maintenance of peace; (3) the insurance of human rights; (4) economic growth and social development; (5) the conservation of natural resources; (6) the preservation of human cultural heritage; and (7) the United Nations' role in solving such problems. The curriculum for peace education should sharpen awareness about the existence of conflict between people and nations, investigate the cause of conflict and violence, and encourage the search for alternatives. The curriculum should develop skills of critical thinking, conflict resolution, and political literacy. Attitudes to be developed include self-respect, respect for others, ecological concern, and commitment to justice. (SM)

AN: EJ392884

AU: Hughes, Steven; Otero, George

TI: Global Education for the Secondary and College Student. PY: 1989

JN: Political-Science-Teacher; v2 n1 p21-23 Win 1989

AB: Describes several activities which successfully involve students in learning about the complex nature of world affairs and issues which are globally interdependent. Activities fall under the four headings of awareness of planet, interdependence, multiple perspectives, and conflict management. Describes resources to use with the activities. (KO)

AN: ED291649

TI: International Dimensions of Education. Position Paper and Recommendations for Action, November 1985. CS: Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C. PY: 1985

AV: Council of Chief State School Officers, 400 North Capitol, N.W., Washington, DC 20001. NT: 19 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOL Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

AB: This statement includes the Council of Chief State Officer's (CCSSO) position on the international dimensions of education and presents a series of proposed action steps. The international dimensions of education are fourfold: (1) the capacity to communicate in languages other than English; (2) understanding of other nations, cultures, and people; (3) the capacity to compare educational systems across national boundaries; and (4) the exchange of educational practices. The recommendations are directed at the CCSSO, federal agencies, state education agencies, local education agencies, and colleges and universities. Among the recommendations are the following: the CCSSO should provide leadership in improving the quality of second language study and the teaching of international education; federal agencies should strengthen the international education capacities in the U.S. Department of Education programs through mission statements addressing cross-national studies; state education agencies should work with state boards of education to establish policy statements improving and expanding the international dimensions of education; local education agencies should support programs designed to strengthen second language study and international education; college and universities should establish second language requirements for admission. (SM)

AN: ED295889

AU: Larson, James F.

TI: Global Television and Foreign Policy. Headline Series No. 283.

CS: Foreign Policy Association, New York, N.Y.

PY: 1988

AV: Deloris Gruber, Foreign Policy Association, 729 Seventh Ave., New York, NY 10019 (\$4.00). NT: 77 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOL Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

AB: This document explores the impact of television coverage on foreign policy decision-making and the complexities of a changing media-foreign policy relationship in an era of global television. Government officials believe that television news has a great effect on foreign policy decisions. By contrast, many political scientists contend that television is subject to government news management and conveys an elite view of U.S. overseas interests. Television coverage and its potential impact on public opinion are factors to be planned and controlled in the implementation of foreign policy, according to this perspective. Chapter 1 explores television's role in the U.S. foreign policy process. Chapter 2 delineates the rise of television news to its dominant position in the politics of foreign policy through the confluence of technology, economics, public reliance on television as a news source, and a set of international concerns. Chapter 3 discusses how foreign policy and international news should be defined and handled by broadcasters. Chapter 4 outlines the advent of global television as a participant in the foreign policy process. Chapter 5 examines whether or not the public influences foreign policy. Chapter 6 elucidates the manner in which television's growing capacity as a channel for global communication will affect its relationship to the foreign policy process in the future. This issue concludes with student and community discussion questions and resources. (SM)

AN: ED294825 TI: Model Curriculum for Human Rights and Genocide.

CS: California State Board of Education, Sacramento.

PY: 1987

AV: Bureau of Publications Sales, California State Department of Education, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802 (\$3.25). NT: 73 p. PR: EDRS Price - MFOL Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

AB: Concern for human rights is a major element in the California State Board of Education's "History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve," and this document contains resources and guidelines to help teachers and curriculum developers integrate the teaching of human rights into their courses. Part 1 of this document contains a model that can be used by developers of curricula. This section also provides the philosophical basis for including studies on human rights and genocide in the curriculum; the location in the History-Social Science Framework where these learnings can be integrated;

and questions that will engage students in critical thinking on this topic. Part 2 contains curriculum resources to help school districts develop their history-social science curriculum. Appendix A is a summary of where human rights and genocide are addressed in the History-Social Science Framework and includes: (1) the goals and curricula that focus on human rights and genocide; (2) course descriptions; and (3) criteria for evaluating instructional materials. Appendix B offers vignettes that provide background to teachers on issues and events of human rights and genocide, including: (1) chapters 3, 5, and 6 of the Connecticut State Department of Education's resource guide, "Human Rights: The Struggle for Freedom, Dignity and Equality"; (2) "The Armenian Genocide"; (3) "The Ukrainian Genocide"; and (4) "Mass Murder and Genocide of Poles During World War II." (SM)

AN: ED295851

AU: Moynihan, Daniel Patrick

TI: The United States in Opposition. Ethics and Public Policy Reprint 4. CS: Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, DC.

PY: 1977

AV: University Press of America, 4710 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706 (\$.50).

NT: 36 p.; Reprinted from *Commentary*, Volume 59, Number 3 (March 1975, pp31-44). PR: EDRS Price - MFOL Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

AB: A majority of the world's nations believe that there are claims which can be made on individual nations' wealth that are both considerable and threatening to countries such as the United States. This attitude was demonstrated in the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1974. It may be argued that this attitude is a result of the British revolution which began in 1947 with the granting of independence to socialist India. The British revolution of the second quarter of the 20th century attracted little attention. While everyone recognized that new states were coming into existence from former European and mostly British colonies, it was not generally perceived that they came to independence with a preexisting stable ideological base which was British socialism. The spread of British socialism to the furthest reaches of the globe, with its ascent to dominance in the highest national councils everywhere, gives worldwide significance to the British revolution. Of the 87 states that have joined the United Nations since its founding, more than one-half (47) had been part of the British empire. Socialism, as it developed in Great Britain was anti-U.S. because the United States was viewed as capitalistic. The United States has not dealt with these new nations successfully because they did not recognize this ideology. At the level of world affairs, the United States has

learned to deal with communism; the task is now to learn to deal with socialism. (SM)

AN: ED295878

AU: Nash, Evelyn; And Others

TI: Social Studies: High School Guide for Teaching about Human Rights. CS: Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Curriculum Development Services. PY: 1981

NT: 235 p.; For related documents, see SO 019 081-084.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PC10 Plus Postage.

AB: The implementation of the Detroit, Michigan, human rights curriculum at the high school level is done through a series of classroom activities and resources appropriate for high school students. Each of the lessons is structured around one of the ten major goals identified in the curriculum and provides objectives, learner outcomes, activities, and resources. Understanding the interdependence of people is carried out by having students engage in activities designed to show that the needs and wants of all people are the same and are provided by the earth's finite resources that are the heritage of all humanity. Various activities are designed to help students understand the similarities of ethnic groups, such as the study of the traditional "rites of passage" for different cultures. Among many activities designed to develop an appreciation of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, students are asked to describe documents that protect them from injustice. An example of activities developed to understand how governments at the national, state, and local levels affect one's human rights, students role play a situation of conflict between two confederate states. To understand how human rights contribute to human dignity and self-esteem, students discuss and analyze laws and practices that were developed to protect either males or females and determine how they became "two-edged swords" that afforded and denied protection. (SM)

AN: ED296946

AU: Natoli, Salvatore J., Ed.

TI: Strengthening Geography in the Social Studies. National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin No. 81. CS: National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C. PY: 1988

NT: 139 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PC06 Plus Postage.

AB: This bulletin is an outgrowth of the work of the Geographic Education National Implementation Project (GENIP), whose purpose is to implement

the recommendations contained in the National Council for Geographic Education-Association of American Geographers 1984 publication, Guidelines for Geographic Education: Elementary and Secondary Schools. The bulletin is an attempt to demonstrate the power of geographical content, including the concepts and skills of geography as they relate to various components of the social studies curriculum. Salvatore J. Natoli and Charles F. Gritzner emphasize in Chapter 1 that the goal of modern geographic education is to teach knowledge about the earth and to use that knowledge for personal enlightenment and development. In Chapter 2, Joseph M. Cirrincione and Richard T. Farrell examine a study of some of the curricular issues facing professional geographers and educators. In Chapters 3 and 4, Michael Libbee and Joseph Stoltman discuss geography within the social studies curriculum from an historical perspective, and also the place of geography in the social studies scope and sequence. In Chapter 5, Dennis L. Spetz addresses the problem of adequate preparation of teachers of geography. In Chapter 6, Robert W. Morrill, James Sellers, and Stephen A. Justham discuss the nuclear explosion at Chernobyl (Ukraine, USSR), as an example of global interdependence. George Vuicich, Joseph Stoltman, and Richard G. Boehm discuss the fundamental skills of geography in Chapter 7. James F. Marran, Salvatore Natoli, and Joan Juliette explore ways to include more geography in the curriculum in Chapter 8. Finally, in Chapter 9, Richard Farrell and Joseph Cirrincione discuss the results of a study of how a national sample of social studies teachers viewed the five fundamental themes of geography outlined in Guidelines for Geographic Education. (SM)

AN: ED291651

AU: Nyquist, Corinne

TI: Human Rights and Citizenship: A Community Resource Manual. Foreign Area Materials Center Occasional Publication 27. CS: New York State Education Dept., Albany. Center for International Programs and Comparative Studies. PY: 1981

NT: 34 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO2 Plus Postage.

AB: Human Rights Week (December 10-17) has been proclaimed by the U.S. President for a number of years because Bill of Rights Day (December 15) and Human Rights Day (December 10) are observed within a week's period. This comprehensive survey of resources for the study of human rights contains books, films, filmstrips, organizations, and learning activities. Section 1 lists contact groups for obtaining pamphlets and posters for publicizing Human Rights Week. Section 2 presents over 30 non-governmental and governmental U.S. -based organizations that may provide material and publications in the international human rights field.

People and groups in the community who may be used as resources are described in section 3. Section 4 describes an exhibit relating human rights and gives instructions for setting up the exhibit. Section 5 outlines learning strategies that may be used in a classroom setting or in a community group. Section 6 is an annotated bibliography of the ten most wanted books on human rights. Section 7 is a general bibliography including books and periodicals. The document concludes with a media bibliography of films, filmstrips, records, multimedia, and film catalogs to be used in the study of human rights. (SM)

AN: EJ366769

AU: Peters, Richard

TI: The Decade for Global Education and International Competence.

PY: 1988

JN: Social-Studies-Teacher; v9 n3 p3 Feb-Mar 1988

AB: Offers a brief review of the development of global education in the United States and notes contemporary efforts to advance global education in U.S. schools. Argues that social studies education must be oriented toward contemporary world issues with curricula rooted in basic concepts, content, and skills development. (GEA)

AN: ED299218

AU: Roach, Patricia Betts, Ed.

TI: Teaching for Global Perspective: A Resource Handbook.

CS: Arkansas State Dept. of Education, Little Rock.

PY: 1988

AV: Arkansas Department of Education, 4 Capitol Mall, Little Rock, 72201. NT: 353 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PC15 Plus Postage.

AB: This state resource guide of approximately 250 lesson units for teaching global studies provides 18 topics and 3-12 lessons for each topic. The topics include global perspective, using models, balance of power, conflict, development, global environment, global resources, global trade, human rights, hunger, ideologies, international organization, international relations, technology, terrorism, world population, and world religions. Each unit contains an overview, lessons, and a resource list, and each lesson includes: (1) a theme; (2) a specific title; (3) objectives; (4) information on how to begin the lesson; (5) procedures for lecture/discussion; (6) a guided activity; (7) information about how to end the lesson; (8) an independent activity; and (9) resource materials. The guide

also includes student activity sheets and maps that can be used as resources. (DJC)

AN: ED292716

AU: Sapp, Gary L.; Skelton, Sarah C.

TI: Determining Accuracy of Cultural Perceptions of Oriental Cultures. PY: 1987

NT: 24 p. ; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the MidSouth Educational Research Association (Memphis, TN, November 13, 1987). PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PCOI Plus Postage.

AB: Do social studies textbooks used in U.S. schools provide an unbiased view of other cultures? This research study analyzes five social studies textbook series and 26 children's literature books used as supplementary materials for teaching about Oriental cultures. The instrument used was the Evaluation Coefficient Analysis (ECA) with the focus on value judgements used to describe Oriental cultures in the materials examined in the study. The criteria used were that the textbooks should be for the sixth grade level and that the children's literature should be used as supplementary materials. The results showed that of 94 textbook terms which were rated, 60 percent were viewed as favorable, 36 percent unfavorable, and 4 percent neutral. In the children's literature, 70 percent of the 17 terms evaluated were favorable and 30 percent were unfavorable, with 1 percent neutral. The findings suggested that selected social studies textbooks do not provide a negative stereotypical representation of Oriental cultures as indicated by a favorable rating on the ECA. Charts, tables, and a 26-item bibliography are appended. (NL)

AN: EJ391386

AU: Sheram, Katherine A.

TI: Getting Started: Teaching about Development.

PY: 1989

JN: Social-Education; V53 n4 p219-21 Apr-May 1989

AV: UMI

AB: Presents classroom activities that have been effectively used by teachers to sensitize students toward the complexities of life in rich and poor countries. Lists several guidelines for helping students learn about development. Sees development as a topic which can fit into a variety of curricula. (KO)

AN: EJ287612

AU: Schukar, Ron

TI: Curriculum Development and Global Perspectives: Challenges and Responses.

PY: 1983

JN: Educational-Research-Quarterly; v8 n1 p91-95 1983

AV: UMI

AB: This paper explores some of the reasons why global perspectives education has not found its way into the school curriculum. It also offers some strategies for implementing global perspectives education in school programs. (BW)

AN: ED288746

AU: Smith, Andrew F.; Brown, Walter

TI: Research on Learning Packages and Course Syllabi Developed for International Studies Courses: A Collection, Analysis and Dissemination Project. A Final Report to the U.S. Department of Education on the Status of the International Research and Studies Program. CS: Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs, New York, N.Y.; Global Perspectives in Education, Inc., New York, N.Y. PY: 1986

NT: 110 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PC05 Plus Postage.

AB: The goals of the 1984 Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs (CISP) and Global Perspectives in Education (GPE) study were to: (1) collect international instructional materials developed for use in precollege and undergraduate courses; (2) develop a materials classification scheme; (3) evaluate the collected materials; (4) disseminate information about high quality materials; and (5) assess the strengths and weaknesses of the collected materials and recommend future development, evaluation, and dissemination processes. This document describes the major criteria and procedures utilized for materials selection to achieve the stated goals and considers the federal government's role in international studies education. Recommendations for federal agencies and departments include: (1) encourage existing federally funded programs to incorporate precollege global studies programs; (2) increase the funding for federal programs which support the development of global education programs; (3) improve the liaison among federal agencies that fund global education activities; (4) fund research projects, K-12 and college-level consortium programs, and summer institutes; and (5) increase funding to area studies centers. Appendices include the project's financial report, steering committee members, classification scheme, key word index, three bibliographies containing 91 citations, and the May, 1986 issue of "Access," which highlights global education in New Jersey. (JHP)

AN: ED295879

TI: Social Studies: Appendix for Elementary, Middle, and High School Guides for Teaching about Human Rights. CS: Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Curriculum Development Services. PY: 1982 NT: 579 p.; For related documents, see SO 019 081-083.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO3/PC24 Plus Postage.

AB: Seventy documents including primary source materials, simulations, mock trials, short stories, vignettes, and statistical data are provided for the implementation of the elementary, middle, and high school human rights curriculum. Original documents include: (1) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; (2) the Declaration of the Rights of the Child; and (3) the Charter of the United Nations. "Thermal Pollution: Background Material for a Mock Trial," highlights an unusual case of thermal pollution that occurred when cold water was introduced into an artificially warmed tidewater stream in New Jersey. "The 100% American" is a vignette designed to initiate discussion on the many contributions of other cultures to the U.S. way of life. The list of "65 Ways To Say That's a Job Well Done," shows how self-esteem can be engendered in students. "Body Ritual Among the Nacerima: A Study in Ethnocentrism" is a parody that describes some "strange customs" of Americans. Statistical data is provided on the number and percent of persons below the poverty level from 1959 to 1974, and research is cited on prejudice and discrimination. The document also includes: (1) a filmography of filmstrips on human rights for elementary, middle, and high school classes; (2) a filmography of soundfilms on human rights for elementary, middle and high school students; and (3) an extensive annotated bibliography on human rights for elementary, middle, and high schools. (SM)

AN: ED294806

AU: Solomon, Warren, Comp.

TI: Missouri in the World: A Resource Guide for Social Studies. CS: Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City. PY: 1987

AV: Center for Educational Assessment, 403 South Sixth Street, Columbia, MO 65211 (\$4.15). NT: 133 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PC06 Plus Postage.

AB: This guide introduces students to important concepts about international relationships through classroom activities that should stimulate their curiosity. Chapter 1 discusses ways to integrate the guide with the Missouri state curriculum. Twenty activities in Chapter 2 can be integrated into various social studies subjects. The format for the activities includes: (1) the purpose, grade level, subject, and unit; (2) the materials and

resources; (3) strategies for conducting the activity; and (4) methods to modify the activity for different age levels. Examples of activities are using biographies to learn more about state personalities, tracing footsteps into the past, and learning from exchange students. Twenty-eight activity ideas for teachers to use in creating their own lessons are provided in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 lists resources for teaching about the state and the world. Core competencies and key skills for Missouri schools are appended. (SM)

AN: EJ391388

AU: Swing, Nancy; Smithey, Sandra

TI: A Selected List of Resources for Development Educators. PY: 1989

JN: Social-Education; v53 n4 p224-26 Apr-May 1989

AV: UMI

AB: Lists materials which have been proven successful in helping students appreciate the extent of the U.S. interconnectedness with developing nations. Provides critiques of resources that have the potential for stimulating consideration of ways in which international development might be aided. Considers books, audiovisual materials, classroom materials, and background materials. (KO)

AN: ED285805

AU: Thelin, Bengt

TI: Peace Education: Peace-Liberty-Development-Human Rights. Service Material

S 86:3. CS: National Swedish Board of Education, Stockholm.

PY: 1986

NT: 23 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/P01 Plus Postage.

AB: In Sweden, as in many other countries, interest and instruction concerning the conditions and prospects of peace have grown against the background of current world events. Increasing pupils' knowledge and awareness of the survival problems in the world are the keys to peace education. Most aspects of peace education are more or less included in the syllabi for civics, history, and religious education courses, but responsibility for teaching the international aspects is shared among teachers of all subjects. The Swedish curriculum prescribes and supports well-planned international instruction, with particular emphasis on the conditions and prospects of peace. The content of peace education is summed up in terms of peace, liberty, development, and human rights. The task for the student is to acquire and apply an active view of knowledge. (SM)

AN: ED295877

AU: Todorov, Karen; and others

TI: Social Studies: Middle School Guide for Teaching about Human Rights. CS: Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Curriculum Development Services. PY: 1981

NT: 170 p.; For related documents, see SO 019 081-084.

PR: EDRS Price - MFO1/PCO7 Plus Postage.

AB: Implementation of the ten major goals and various objectives of the Detroit, Michigan, curriculum for teaching middle school students about human rights is done through a number of activities and resources. Each of the lessons is structured around one of the major goals and provides objectives, learner outcomes, activities, and resources. An examination of the finiteness of the earth's resources and the idea that these resources are the heritage of all humanity and generations engenders the idea that people are interdependent. To develop an awareness of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the Rights of the Child as a goal for world peace and cooperation, students examine the major sections of these documents. Students learn about the impact of government on their lives through engaging in activities discussing civil rights and reviewing major U.S. documents. To understand the development of self-esteem in individuals, students role play personal security, political freedom, and social justice and discuss the abrogation of human rights in the world. The concept that all people should be treated with dignity is developed through the study of the commonalities and the differences among people. Students examine the idea that racism and sexism are the results of political and economic structures of particular societies and describe how racism supports economic and political power systems. (SM)

AN: EJ287609

AU: Tucker, Jan L.

TI: Teacher Attitudes Toward Global Education: A Report From Dade County.

PY: 1983

JN: Educational-Research-Quarterly; v8 n1 p65-77 1983

AV: UMI

AB: The research reported here was undertaken as part of an assessment of the Global Awareness Program dealing with teacher attitudes toward global education in general. Overall, teachers expressed a positive attitude toward global education, and noted the lack of appropriate instructional materials as the biggest obstacle to the growth of global education. (BW)

AN: ED290681

AU: Wade, Kenneth

TI: Social Studies 9-10: Global Studies. Tentative Syllabus. CS:
New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Curriculum
Development. PY: 1987

NT: 213 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MFOI/PCO9 Plus Postage.

AB: This syllabus provides a guide for administrators and teachers in selecting strategies and materials to achieve the New York state social studies program goals and objectives for global education. The first section lists the state goals for elementary, secondary, and continuing education. The second section delineates the social studies skills of the K-12 program. The third section includes knowledge, skills, and attitude objectives for the global studies course. The remainder of the syllabus outlines the specifics of the course. The course is comprised of eight units on: Africa; South and Southeast Asia; East Asia; Latin America; the Middle East; Western Europe; the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; and the world today. Each unit is introduced by goals and objectives. Content, major ideas, and model activities are outlined for the unit. The 15 concepts that the 7-12 social studies program is built on are developed and enhanced in this two-year global studies course. Guidelines for integrating handicapped students are appended. (SM)

AN: EJ376931

AU: Weaver, V. Phillips

TI: Education that is Multicultural and Global: An Imperative for Economic and Political Survival. PY: 1988

JN: Social-Studies; v79 n3 pl07-09 May-Jun 1988

AV: UMI

AB: Cites a study conducted by the Southern Governor's Association which reported that U.S. youth are multiculturally illiterate. Provides a conceptual approach to multicultural education that focuses on eight concepts which can be used in all curriculum areas. Outlines a sample lesson from the Charles County-University of Maryland program. (BSR)

AN: EJ358601

AU: Wulff, Kenneth R.

TI: How to Do It: International Students in the Classroom.

PY: 1987

JN: Social-Education; v51 n6 p415-22 Oct 1987

AV: UMI

AB: Part of an ongoing series offering teaching advice and practical ideas on social studies topics, this insert offers a brief rationale and an assortment of teaching ideas for working with international students in the K-12 classroom. Included is a list of international exchange and global studies organizations. (JDH)

Addendum

I. The first part of the addendum contains recent books and articles on world affairs that should be useful to educators seeking an overview of post-cold war international and global issues.

Books

Attali, Jacques, *Millennium: Winners and Losers in the Coming World Order*, (translated from the French by Leila Conners and Nathan Gardels) Times Books, a division of Random House, New York, 1991, the president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development predicts an intense three-way struggle for global economic supremacy in which Japan and Europe may supplant the United States as the chief economic superpowers.

Brogan, Patrick, *The Fighting Never Stopped*, Vintage Books, a division of Random House, New York, 1990, is a comprehensive guide to the more than 80 wars and 40 low intensity conflicts in the world since 1945.

Cleveland, Harlar, *Birth of a New World*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1993, presents a comprehensive strategy for peaceful change in this "open moment" in world history.

Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man*, Free Press, New York, 1992, is the book-length version of the author's thesis that we have reached the final (democratic) stage in the development of human consciousness articulated by Hegel in the 19th century.

Gore, Al, *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1992, argues that the severity of the global environmental crisis requires radical rethinking about the relationship between humans and nature.

Hancock, Graham, *Lords of Poverty*, Atlantic Monthly Press, New York, 1989; a former international organization official is highly critical of development assistance.

Harries, Owen (edit.), *America's Purpose: Towards A New Vision of U.S. Foreign Policy*, ICS Press, San Francisco, 1991, consists of essays by prominent national figures (Stephan Solarz, Ben Wattenberg, Pat Buchanan) articulating different foreign policy strategies.

de Marenches, Count and Andelman, David A, *The Fourth World War: Diplomacy and Espionage in the Age of Terrorism*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, 1992, a former chief of French Intelligence and an American journalist argue that the East-West cold war (the "Third World War") has already been supplemented by an intensifying North-South conflict, an unconventional "Fourth World War."

Mueller, John, *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War*, Basic Books, New York, 1989, suggests that major war between developing countries is becoming obsolete and may eventually disappear in the same way that earlier long standing social practices such as slavery and dueling have, for the most part, disappeared in the modern world.

Muravchik, Joshua, *Exporting Democracy: Fulfilling America's Destiny*, AEI, Washington, D.C., 1991, argues that American foreign policy should support the extension of democracy world-wide.

Nixon, Richard, *Seize the Moment: America's Challenge in a One-Superpower World*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1992, articulates the former president's geopolitical strategy for American global leadership in the 21st century.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr., *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, Basic Books, New York, 1990, argues that the "declinists" are wrong and that America will remain the world's leader, albeit by different means than in the past.

Tye, Kenneth A. (edit.), *Global Education: From Thought to Action*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA, 1990, is a collection of essays by proponents of global education that argues for the infusion of a "global perspective" throughout the K-12 curriculum.

Weigel, George, *The Final Revolution: The Resistance Church and the Collapse of Communism*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992, argues that the Revolution of 1989 was moral and spiritual rather than economic or political, in the narrow sense.

Wriston, Walter B., *The Twilight of Sovereignty*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1992, declares that we are living in the midst of an information revolution as momentous as the original industrial revolution. The author, the former chairman of Citicorp, argues that this information revolution is creating a global economy and fostering transnational interdependence that will inevitably diminish national sovereignty and loyalty, and the power of the nation-state.

Articles

Barnet, Richard, et al., "American Priorities in a New World Era," *World Policy Journal*, Spring 1989, is a statement endorsed by Robert Reich, Carl Sagan, Randall Forsberg, Lester Brown, Hodding Carter, Ann Lewis and others that recommends new economic, social and environmental priorities for the challenges posed by changing international circumstances.

Bergsten, Fred C., "The Primacy of Economics," *Foreign Policy*, Summer 1992, recommends that American leaders place economic concerns at the center of the nation's foreign policy priorities.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, "Empowering the United Nations," *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1992/1993, argues for an expanded U. N. role to strengthen international peace and security. The author asserts that this new role will require an intellectual re-examination of traditional concepts of sovereignty.

Fox, Robin, "War and Human Nature," *The National Interest*, Winter 1992-93, argues that war is intrinsically connected to basic attributes of human nature and unlikely to disappear despite the advance of democracy and global interdependence.

Fukuyama, Francis, "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, Summer 1989, is an article that generated great interest among American and international foreign policy and intellectual elites. The author states that the philosophical triumph of liberal democracy has ended serious conflict over political ideas.

Gray, Colin, "Strategic Sense, Strategic Nonsense," *The National Interest*, Fall 1992, argues historical awareness is critical to planning geopolitical strategy.

Huntington, Samuel, "Religion and the Third Wave," *The National Interest*, Summer 1991, discusses the successive waves of the democratic revolution and the significance of different religions.

Kapstein, Ethan B., "We Are Us: The Myth of the Multinational," *National Interest*, Winter 1991/1992, argues that large corporations have not become "transnational" because they remain dependent upon the power and authority of their home nation-state.

Krauthammer, Charles, "The Unipolar Moment," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 70, No. 1, 1991.

Lind, Michael, "The Catalytic State," *The National Interest*, Spring 1992.

Mathews, Jessica Tuchman, "Redefining Security," *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1989.

McNeill, William H., "Winds of Change," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 69, No. 4, Fall 1990.

Myers, Norman, "Environment and Security," *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1989.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr., "Soft Power," *Foreign Policy*, Fall 1990.

Tyrrell, Ian, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History" and Michael McGerr, "The Price of the New Transnational History," two articles in *The American Historical Review*, Oct., 1991, debate the importance of national history within the broader context of world history.

Vlahos, Michael, "Culture and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1991.

Weigel, George, "Religion and Peace," *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 1991.

Weigel, George, "On the Road to Isolationism?" *Commentary*, Jan. 1992.

Zakaria, Fareed, "Is Realism Finished?" *The National Interest*, Winter 1992-93, makes a new case for a prudent American foreign policy based on realism and national interest.

II. The second part of the addendum contains historical documents that highlight the abiding conceptual issues and continuing debate over America's role in world affairs.

Several of *The Federalist Papers* specifically examine issues of foreign policy and national security. See particularly, Federalist 6, 7, 8, 11, 24, 25 by Alexander Hamilton and Federalist 3, 4, 5 by John Jay in Rossiter, Clinton, *The Federalist Papers*, The New American Library, Inc., New York, 1961.

The spirit of a complex and vigorous foreign policy debate among America's most prominent Founding Fathers over issues of national interest, strategy, morality, peace, and support for freedom in the world is captured in a series of excerpts from crucial primary documents conveniently gathered together in *The Annals of America: Vol. 3, 1784-1796*, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, 1987, pp. 531-557. Hereafter listed as *Annals*. See George Washington: Proclamation of Neutrality; James Madison: For Congressional Leadership of Foreign Affairs; Alexander Hamilton: Neutrality and the National Interest; Thomas Jefferson: For Our Alliance with France; Alexander Hamilton: Against Our Alliance with France.

Washington, George, "Farewell Address" in Brockway, Thomas P., (edit.), *Basic Documents in United States Foreign Policy*, D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, 1957. (Hereafter listed as *Basic Documents*).

Jefferson, Thomas, "On the Barbary Pirates," *Annals: Vol. 3*, pp. 59-61. In a letter to John Adams, Jefferson analyzed the choices between negotiation and war in dealing with North African pirates who were holding Americans hostage and attacking American commerce.

Jefferson, Thomas, "The Threat of the French in Louisiana," *Annals: Vol. 4*, pp. 150-152. Thomas Jefferson outlined his geopolitical thinking on the Louisiana territory before purchasing it from Napoleon.

Madison, James, "War Message to Congress," June 1, 1812, in Commager, Henry Steele (edit.), *Documents of American History, Third Edition*, F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1947. (Hereafter listed as *Commager*).

Clay, Henry, "Recognition of Latin American Governments," *Annals: Vol. 5, 1821-1832*, pp. 488-89.

Adams, John Quincy, "The Caribbean and Our National Interest," *Annals: Vol. 5, 1821-1832*, pp. 57-61. Secretary of State Adams warned Spain not to sell Cuba to Great Britain.

Monroe, James, "The Monroe Doctrine," Dec. 2, 1823 in *Commager*.

Polk, James K., "Reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine," *Annals: Vol. 7, 1841-1849*, pp. 301-303.

Polk, James K., "California and Mexico," *Annals: Vol. 7 1841-1849*, pp. 374-378.

Polk, James K., "Message to Congress on War with Mexico," May 11, 1846, *Commager*.

Corwin, Thomas, "Against the Mexican War," Ravitch, Diane (edit.), *The American Reader: Words That Moved a Nation*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York, 1990, pp. 77-79. (Hereafter listed as *Ravitch*).

Blaine, James G. "Invitation to Pan-American Congress," Nov. 29, 1881, *Commager*.

Olney, Richard, "U.S. Jurisdiction in the Western Hemisphere," *Annals: Vol. 12*, pp. 5-8.

Bryan, William Jennings, "The Paralyzing Influence of Imperialism," *Annals: Vol. 12*, pp. 345-352. Bryan condemned U.S. expansion in the Philippines.

Roosevelt, Theodore, "Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine," Dec. 6, 1904, *Basic Documents and Commager*.

Mahan, Alfred Thayer, "Arbitration and the Moral Aspect of War," *Annals: Vol. 12*, pp. 329-334.

James, William, "The Moral Equivalent of War," original essay in McClure's, August, 1910, key excerpts in *Annals: Vol. 13, 1905-1915*, pp. 254-260. American philosopher William James articulated his views on war and peace in a famous essay.

Wilson, Woodrow, "Peace Without Victory," Jan. 22, 1917; Speeches to U.S. Senate, U.S. Congress, 2nd Sess., Senate Document 685 in *Commager*.

Root, Elihu, "The European War and Preservation of American Ideals," *Annals: Vol. 14, 1916-1928*, pp. 70-74. Root criticized President Wilson's "Peace Without Victory" position.

Norris, George, "Against Entry into the War," April 4, 1917, *Ravitch*, pp. 242-244. Senator Norris declared Wall Street was supporting World War I for selfish financial interests.

Wilson, Woodrow, "The Fourteen Points," Jan. 8, 1918, in *Basic Documents* and *Commager*.

"Kellog-Briand Treaty," August 27, 1928 in *Basic Documents* and *Commager*. Text of treaty outlawing war was developed by American Secretary of State Kellogg and French Foreign Minister Briand in the 1920s.

Roosevelt, Franklin D., "Quarantine the Aggressors Speech," October 5, 1937, in *Basic Documents*.

Roosevelt, Franklin D., "Four Freedoms Speech; Message to the U.S. Congress," January 6, 1941, in Hofstadter, Richard and Beatrice (eds.), *Great Issues in American History: Reconstruction to the Present Day, 1864-1980*. Vintage Book, New York, 1982. (Hereafter listed as *Great Issues*).

Lindbergh, Charles A., "Speech on America and the War," April 23, 1941, in *Great Issues*. Lindbergh attacked Roosevelt's pro-Allied foreign policy as leading to war.

Roosevelt, Franklin D., "The Atlantic Charter," August 14, 1941, in *Commager* and *Great Issues*.

Lippmann, Walter, "Foreign Policy and Vital Interests," excerpts in *Annals: Vol. 16, 1940-1949*, pp. 192-198.

Wilkie, Wendell L., "Toward One World," excerpts in *Annals: Vol. 16, 1940-1949*, pp. 198-205.

Vandenberg, Arthur, "Sovereignty and the United Nations," *Annals: Vol. 16, 1940-1949*, pp. 331-333. Senator Vandenberg argued that the U.N. Charter did not limit U.S. sovereignty.

Kennan, George F., "The Long Telegram," February 22, 1946, in Jensen, Kenneth (edit.), *Origins of the Cold War: The Novikov, Kennan, and Roberts "Long Telegrams" of 1946*, United States Institute of Peace, Washington, DC, 1991, pp. 17-31. George Kennan, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, developed the outlines of the "containment" (of Soviet expansionism) strategy in his famous "long telegram" from Moscow.

Truman, Harry S., "The Truman Doctrine," March 12, 1947, in *Basic Documents and Great Issues*.

Marshall, George C., "The Marshall Plan," November 10, 1948, in *Basic Documents*.

Acheson, Dean, "Speech for the North Atlantic Treaty," July 11, 1949, in *Great Issues*.

Taft, Robert A., "Speech Against the North Atlantic Treaty," July 11, 1949, in *Great Issues*.

MacArthur, Douglas, "Address to Congress," April 19, 1951, *Great Issues*.

Dulles, John Foster, "Testimony to Congress on the Policy of Liberation," January 15, 1953, *Great Issues*.

Eisenhower, Dwight D., "Remarks on Peaceful Co-existence," June 30, 1954, *Great Issues*.

Kennedy, John F., "Inaugural Address," January 20, 1961, *Great Issues*.

Kennedy, John F., "A Long Twilight Struggle," *Annals: Vol. 18, 1961-1968*, pp. 54-58.

Johnson, Lyndon B., "American Policy in Vietnam," April 7, 1965, *Great Issues*.

Fulbright, J. William, "The Arrogance of Power," excerpts in *Annals: Vol. 18, 1961-1968*, pp. 362-368.

Nixon, Richard M., "Report on Moscow Summit," June 1, 1972, *Great Issues*.

Carter, Jimmy, "Address on the Camp David Accords," September 18, 1978, *Great Issues*.

Reagan, Ronald, "Speech at Moscow State University," May 31, 1988, *Ravitch*, pp. 364-367.

About the Contributors

Raymond English was vice president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington, D.C., where he directed studies on educational policies. He previously served as director of the social science program of the Educational Research Council of America, Professor and Chairman of the Political Science Department at Kenyon College, and Instructor at Harvard University. Mr. English was a prominent education writer with articles appearing in such journals as *American Scholar* and *Yale Review*. He developed the social science textbook series, *Concepts and Inquiry*, published by Allyn and Bacon in 1964, and edited *Teaching International Politics in High School* in 1989.

Chester E. Finn, Jr. is a founding partner and senior scholar at the Edison Project in Education, and is currently on leave from Vanderbilt University. He has served as Assistant Secretary and Counselor to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education from 1985 to 1988; Staff Assistant to the President of the United States; Special Assistant to the Governor of Massachusetts; and Legislative Director for Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan. The most recent of his seven books is *We Must Take Charge: Our Schools and Our Future*, published by the Free Press in May, 1991. Previous books include *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?* written with Diane Ravitch; *Challenges to the Humanities*, with Ravitch and P. Holley Roberts; and *Scholars, Dollars and Bureaucrats*. Author of more than 150 articles, his work has appeared in such publications as *Change*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Commentary*, *The Public Interest*, *The Washington Post*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Harvard Business Review*, *The American Spectator*, *Comparative Education Review*, *The Boston Globe*, and *The New York Times*.

John D. Fonte is currently a Humanities Administrator at the National Endowment for the Humanities. From 1984 to 1993 he was a Senior Associate in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), United States Department of Education, specializing in civic and international education. He has taught world history, the history of Western civilization, civics, social studies, and American history and government at the university, high school and junior high levels. Dr. Fonte received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago where he studied world history.

Robert K. Fullinwider is Senior Research Scholar in the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy at the University of Maryland. The author of *The Reverse Discrimination Controversy* (1980) and editor of *Conscripts and Volunteers: Military Requirements, Social Justice, and the All-Volunteer Force* (1983) and *The Moral Foundations of Civil Rights* (1986), he currently writes on philosophical issues in civic and moral education. He served as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Global Education of the National Council for the Social Studies.

Owen Harries is the editor of *The National Interest*, a Washington based foreign policy quarterly. He is also the head of the Pacific Security Research Institute in Sydney, Australia. Born and educated in Great Britain, he emigrated to Australia in 1955 and taught at the University of Sydney and New South Wales. In the late 1970s he was head of policy planning in the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and personal adviser successively to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister. In 1982-83 he was Australian ambassador to UNESCO in Paris. He was editor and principal author of *Australia and the Third World* (Australian Government Publishing Service, 1979) and has contributed to leading international affairs journals in the United States, Australia and Great Britain.

Herbert I. London is a John M. Olin Professor of the Humanities at New York University. He created the Gallatin Division at New York University and served as its dean for twenty years. The division was organized to promote the study of "great books" and classic texts. He is a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and founder of its Center for Education and Employment Policy. Dr. London is a noted social critic whose work has appeared in every major newspaper and journal in the country including such diverse publications as *Commentary*, *National Review*, *American Spectator*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Fortune*, *Washington Times*, *New York Magazine*, *New York Times*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Modern Age*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, *Orbis*, and *Encounter*. He is the author of thirteen books, including *Myths That Rule America*, which inspired an NBC television series with the same title, *Why Are They Lying To Our Children?*

Diane Ravitch is a Visiting Fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. From 1991 to 1993 Dr. Ravitch served as Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement and Counselor to the Secretary at the U.S.

Department of Education. She was Adjunct Professor of History and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and author of *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?* (with Chester E. Finn, Jr., 1987), *The School We Deserve* (1985), *The Revisionists Revised* (1978), and *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973* (1974). In addition she has edited six books, including *The American Reader* (1990) and *The Democracy Reader* (with Abigail Thernstrom, 1992). She has written nearly 200 articles and reviews for such publications as the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *New York Daily News*, *The American Scholar*, and *The New Republic*. She was a principal writer (with Charlotte Crabtree) of the California K-12 history-social science curriculum. She received a B.A. from Wellesley College in 1960 and a Ph.D. in history from Columbia University's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1975.

André Ryerson is a writer and education consultant. He holds a Ph.D. from Yale and taught humanities and French literature at Yale and Amherst College for a decade. His articles on history, ethics and education have appeared in *The New Republic*, *Commentary*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Policy Review*, *American Educator* and elsewhere. He served three years on the Massachusetts State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Andrew F. Smith is the president of The American Forum for Global Education, a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to educating American youth for national citizenship in a global age. Previously, he directed The Center for Teaching International Relations at the Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver; was the Executive Director of the California Council for the Social Studies; and was a high school teacher and administrator in San Bernardino, California.

Gilbert T. Sewall is the director of the American Textbook Council and editor of the *Social Studies Review*. He is a former instructor of history at Phillips Academy, Andover, and education editor at *Newsweek* magazine. Sewall is the author of *Necessary Lessons: Decline and Renewal in American Schools* and co-author of *After Hiroshima: America Since 1945*. He also wrote the report *American History Textbooks: An Assessment of Quality* (Education Excellence Network, 1987). His articles on education and other subjects have appeared in *Fortune*, *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, and many other publications.

Index

- AEGIS (Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies) 15, 24, 25, 27, 130, 149
Alexander the Great 60
Alger, Chad 12, 15
America in Transition (National Governors' Association Report) 44, 131, 141
American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education 7
American culture 26
American Federation of Teachers 35, 75, 119, 120, 123, 128, 130, 131, 133
American foreign policy 4, 15, 152, 180, 182
American Founding Fathers
 on human nature 33
 on sustaining popular government 37
American history 1, 3, 5, 33, 52, 56, 61, 64, 72, 119, 143, 183, 185, 188, 189
American political philosophy 33
American values
 normative attitudes towards 32-33
 arguments about 32-33
Amin, Idi 52
Anderson, Charlotte 47
Anderson, Lee 7, 9, 47, 141
Anti-totalitarianism 4
Area studies 5, 6, 8-10, 13, 51, 70-72, 144, 147, 151, 152, 173
Argentina 36, 68

Asia	5, 8, 9, 36, 48, 55, 72, 78, 88, 101, 104, 147, 158, 177	
Asia Society		9
Atlantic Council		14
Aztecs		61
Balance, in international education,		
need for	27-29, 49, 108-110, 125, 171, 180	
Bauer, P.T.		68
Becker, James		7, 9, 12, 13, 159
Berlin, Sir Isaiah		101
Berlin Wall		34
Bill of Rights		33, 88, 170
Bradley Commission on History in the Schools		107, 130
Bretton Woods		104, 105
Buddhism		60
Buthulezi, Chief		68
Butterfield, Fox		81-84, 86, 93
California curriculum		
centered on history and geography		58
religion and religious ideas, importance of		59
world history, study of		56-57
Center for War/Peace Studies		9, 10, 117, 119
Change		
and continuity		106-107
as concept in international education		106-107
Cheney, Lynne V.		33
China, People's Republic of		
Cultural Revolution in		80, 81, 88
description of human rights and civil liberties record		
in educational materials		76-80
executions in		79-80
Chinese culture		6, 61, 80
Christianity		52, 60
Chronology, importance of in history		59
Churchill, Winston		101, 102
Citizenship education	ix, 2, 31-33, 36, 121, 122, 127, 128, 131, 164	
Civic obligations		33
Civics	xi, 2, 32, 34, 35, 47, 50, 175, 188	
Cold War	vii, 1, 4, 16, 34, 102, 108, 135, 152, 179, 180, 185	
Communism	v, 4, 62, 65, 71, 81, 105, 107, 168-169, 181	
Competitiveness		43, 128, 130
Confucianism		60

- Content, centrality of in international education 103-105
Controversy
 in international and global education 15, 26-29, 108-111
 values of American citizenship and 109-111
Cortes, Carlos 46
Cremin, Lawrence 32
Cross-cultural awareness 11
Cultural diversity 27-29
Cultural relativism 6, 8, 27-29, 57-59, 64
Cultural transmission
 compared to cultural transformation 110-111
 American Revolution and Founders and 110-111
Czechoslovakia 34, 36, 65, 82, 133
- Danforth Foundation 7, 13
Declaration of Independence 33, 92, 93
Democracy
 decision making about education in 31-33
 loyalty to 36
 Republican Spain and 36
 subversion of 36
 survival of 35-37
 troubled history of 35-37
 Weimar Germany and 36
Democratic and civic values, importance for citizenship 59-60
Democratic capitalism, neutrality or hostility towards 48
Democratic revolutions vi, 61
Demographics x, 39-41
Determinism 53, 106-107
Dewey, John 32
Diamond, Martin 33
Disarmament 9, 158
Double standards, in foreign policy 100
- Economic development, treatment by
 social studies educators of 68-69
Economics
 importance of the study of 105
 wealth creation and 105, 109
“End of history” 1, 179, 181
English language, importance of for international
 and civic education 1, 51-52
English Revolution 52

INDEX

195

- Goldman, Ari L. 45
Goodlad, John 47
Gorbachev 62, 104
Greece 36, 52, 57
Gulag 89
Gutmann, Amy 32, 33
- Hahn, Carole 25-27
Hamilton, Alexander 32, 183
Hanvey, Robert 11, 46, 145
Harf, James 15
Havel, Vaclav 34
History and geography, as organizing principle
 for international education 52, 58
Hitler, Adolf 52, 62, 101, 104, 107
Hodgkinson, Harold 39
Honig, Bill 56
Hook, Sidney 32
Human nature 33, 37, 79, 152, 181
Human rights
 universal desire for 92-93
 Western and non-Western views of 92-93
Hussein, Saddam 52
- Idea of citizen, origin of 23
Immigrants, allegiance to U.S., issues of 40
Incas 61
India 7, 60, 87, 168
Information explosion x, 39-41
Interdependence 11, 13, 34, 40, 43, 45-47, 59, 102, 104, 153
.... 160, 164-166, 169, 170, 181
 in Europe in 1914 102
 war and 102
International comparisons of student achievement,
 U.S. and other countries 43-44
International politics
 consistency of principles and double standards in 100-101
 differences and similarities with domestic politics 98-99, 106
 judgment in 101, 106
 relationship between principles and circumstances in 100-101
 role of power in 98-99
 state of anarchy and 98, 106

International studies

need for qualified teachers for	56, 63
presented as integrated world history or regional studies	57
values and	57-58
International trade, competition in	44
International understanding	10, 12, 165
Iran	104, 105, 107, 152
Islam	52, 61, 72, 107
Italy	36
 Japan	36, 45, 61, 72, 87, 121, 179
Jefferson, Thomas	39, 183
Jensen, Kenneth	185
Judaism	52
Judeo-Christian tradition	33
Judgment, importance of for international education	106-108
Judgmentalism	28, 29
 Katyn Forest	62
Kerensky, A.	36
Kersten, Katherine	125, 133
Khmer Rouge	81, 91
Khomeini, Ayatollah	52
Kniep, Willard	15, 145, 146
 Lestma, Robert	xi, 11
Lilly Endowment	12
Lippmann, Walter	99-100, 102, 185
London, Herbert	125
Loyalty	
to nation and/or world	4, 23-27, 36, 40
to the United States	40
hyphenated loyalty	40
Loyalty oaths	4
 Madison, James	104, 183
Magna Carta	39
Majority Rule	32, 36
and education in a democratic society	32-33
and minority rights	32-33
Malcolm X	40
"Man: A Course of Study"	8

- Mansfield, Harvey C., Jr. 53
Mao 76, 78-81, 88, 89, 104, 135
 persecution under 79-81
Marxism 33, 90
Mayans 61
Mershon Center 12, 134, 147
Mill, John Stuart 40
Ming Dynasty 61
Monroe Doctrine 100, 184
Montesquieu 104
Multicultural Education 49-51
- Nasser 104
Nation at Risk vi, 13, 16
National Geographic Society 13, 143
“National Goals in Education” vi, 105
National Governors Association (NGA) 31, 136
Nehru 104
New demographics, argument over curriculum revision and x, 39-41
New immigrants, citizenship and in California 55-56
New York State education task force report in 1989,
 “*A Curriculum of Inclusion*” 4
Nihilism 51
Noriega, Manuel 49, 101
Nuclear war 9, 123, 124, 152, 162
- OPEC 105
- Peace, as a goal of foreign policy 100-102
Perestroika 62
Persia 107
Persian Gulf 73, 105
Pickus, Robert 33, 126
Population growth 9, 14, 46, 155
Pot, Pol 52, 58, 104
“Power politics” 99, 106
President’s Commission on Foreign Language
 and International Studies 10, 12, 131
Problem-solving, as concept in international
 and social studies education 107-108
- Ravitch, Diane 33, 184, 187, 189
Red Guards 81

Reformation	52, 61
Relativism (see Cultural Relativism)	
Religion	35, 59, 64, 70, 73, 79, 88, 159, 182
Remy, Richard	12, 146
Renaissance	52, 61
Roman Empire	60, 61
Roosevelt, Franklin D.	45, 185
Rushdie, Salman, <i>The Satanic Verses</i> , controversy over	64
Safavi, Isma'il	107
Sayers, Dorothy, essay on education	67
Scholastic Aptitude Test, charges of discrimination and	41
Scientific Revolution	61, 72
Scruton, Roger	46
Self-esteem, as a goal of the curriculum	50, 169
Shakespeare	39
Shanker, Albert	127
Slavery	52, 53, 60, 91, 105
Smith, Adam	104
Smith, Andrew F.	45, 173
<i>Social Education</i>	7, 46, 68, 73, 150
South Africa	vii, 44, 68, 73, 87, 91-93, 101, 152
Spain	36, 183
Sputnik	5
Stalin, Joseph	52, 62, 104
Stalin-Hitler Pact	62
Stanford Project in International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE)	8, 78-80, 83, 134, 135
Straits of Hormuz	105
Tang Dynasty	61
Teachers, and international education	v, 3-5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16-17, 32-33, 48, 50, 51, 56, 59, 63, 65, 71, 73, 74, 75, 77, 82, 90, 91, 102, 106, 109
Technology	ix, 34, 40, 46, 55, 61, 64, 72, 80, 154, 159, 162, 167, 171
Textbook publishers	16, 59
Textbooks	vii, 3, 5, 35, 45, 51, 53, 59, 63, 64, 68, 71, 73, 74, 76-80, 82, 85, 86, 91, 109, 118, 119, 124, 126, 128, 129, 172, 189
comparison of American and Chinese constitutions in	88
examination of legal system in China and	82
inadequate coverage of issues of human rights and democracy in China in	89-91
need to improve them	51
status of women in China and	85-86

INDEX

199

- "The limits of growth" 9
Third World 7, 48, 68, 69, 104, 108, 154, 180, 188
Tiananmen Square 65, 76, 90
Tucker, Jan 12, 176
- UNESCO 2, 9, 158, 188
Universal Declaration of Human Rights 65, 87, 92, 164, 169, 174, 176
Utopianism 47, 98
- Vietnam 8, 16, 48, 152, 186
Vietnam War 16, 152
- Walesa, Lech 34
Western civilization 51, 188
Whig, view of history 36
Woodward, C. Vann 50
World Affairs Councils 3, 4, 148
World Bank 9
World citizenship, compared to national citizenship 23-27
World Federalism 2
World peace 46, 77, 100, 126, 164, 176
World-centered schools 47
World Without War Council x, 113, 126, 136, 137
- Xiaoping, Deng 83, 85, 88
- Yalta Pact 62
Yeltsin, Boris 104